

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VIII

OCTOBER, 1907

NO. 4

The Russian Revolution.

X. THE PEASANTRY.

The Russian Government has weathered the storm caused by the revolts of the workingmen and middle classes, by the mutinies of the army and the Terroristic acts of individuals. It has not yet come to conclusion with the peasants.

Each of these movements, as I have tried to show in the preceding chapters, has some inherent weakness which has prevented its success in the past, the workingmen are too few, the middle class too divided within itself, the army revolts have had no definite goal, and the Terrorists—unaided—can not hope to overthrow the Government. There is no immediate probability that any of these movements can succeed. The hope—all the hope there is—for the future lies with the peasants.

Eighty million out of the one hundred and five million of Russian citizens are peasants. If these eighty million should act together, by sheer weight of numbers they could get what they want. Those who do not believe that the Revolution will succeed say that the peasants do not know what they want, that they are too dumb and stupid to be an active force even if they did and that anyway they could not act together. All other classes having failed in their efforts to get reforms, interest centers on the peasants and especially on these questions.

What do the peasants want?

Have they brains enough to become a political force?

Will they act together?

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

Innumerable books have been written about the peasants—yet few of them are of strict scientific value. Some show such an absolute lack of sympathy with the peasants that they demand little attention. Some are superficial after the manner of the endless books written in America by adventurous authors after a week's stay in a factory or slum district. And others, evidently inspired by deep sympathy and long study are marred by a visible prejudice on the part of the writer.

There are two broad schools of thought in Russia, the one that holds that Russian development has been and will be unique, the other that the progress of Russia must follow the course of Western Europe. These two conflicting philosophical principles have, not only caused the main split in the Socialist Movement—the Revolutionary Socialist Party and the Social Democratic Party—but are apparent in all branches of thought. According to the first school the organization of the peasant communities on co-operative and communistic principles is a distinctly Russian institution and this socialistic tendency is on the increase and holds the germ of the future Russian evolution. According to the other school, these co-operative phenomena are only survivals of a prehistoric communism which existed the world over and which are and ought to be disappearing in order that Russia may take her place as an industrial, capitalistic country side by side with other European nations. In the desire to support one or the other of these theories many able Russians have given years to the study of peasant conditions. But they have generally observed the facts through the medium of a preconceived theory instead of following the only scientific method of building their theory on observed facts. It is always easy to find facts to prove a theory and hard to notice ones opposed to it. So these studies of peasant life are extremely contradictory. It is probable that the error lies with both sides and that the truth is somewhere between them.

However, it is no longer necessary to go to books for information about the peasants. In the last two years they have found voice and have spoken for themselves. "The Peasant Union" and "The Labor Group" have framed their demands in a manner which clears away all doubt. I have spoken about both of these organizations before, but will discuss them now in a different light—as mouthpieces of the peasantry.

The Peasant Union was started in November of 1905 and in the first convention assembled some hundred odd peasant delegates from different parts of the Empire. The Union presented itself to the people not as a Political Party asking adherence to a certain definite programme, but as a class organization with the aim of formulating a class platform. With this end in view the convention drew up an appeal to the peasants which they

circulated widely. In this appeal they explained, in the simplest language, the object of the organization, called on the peasants to organize locals in their village, to send the names of members to the Central Committee, and above all to formulate their demands. A suggested set of demands accompanied the appeal—to act as a basis—but the peasants were urged to consider them carefully, to strike out any which did not appeal to them, to add others according to their local needs, or to substitute entirely different ones if they wished. The collecting of responses was interfered with by the postal strike which preceded the December Insurrection and was definitely ended by the repressive measures of the Government which followed it. But before the outbreak the Central Committee had already received several thousands and over a million peasants were enrolled. These documents coming as they did from the most widely separated parts of the Empire, showed a wonderful similarity in the wants of the peasants. There were some special demands—the peasants near the rivers wanted certain restrictions removed from fishing etc. But in the main the demands were surprisingly uniform. Most of these papers have been scattered by successive police raids on the Central Bureau in Moscow. The loss is incalculable, on account of their resemblance to the reports of their grievances with the French Peasants sent to the States General in 1798, and which gave such a vivid picture of the condition in that country previous to the Revolution.

The same surprising solidarity of the immense peasant class was shown by The Labor Group in the Duma. The deputies gave voice to the peasant demands at every opportunity. In order that their delegates should not forget anything the peasants took ample means to keep their minds fresh. During the session some 20,000 letters and telegrams were received by the peasant deputies reminding them of the needs of their constituents. And besides this nearly a hundred "Overseers" were sent from different localities to overlook the actions of their representatives and see that they did their duty. The peasants often selected young and educated men for their deputies, teachers, village clerks and the like, but these "Overseers" were invariably old men, typical big-bearded, wise-eyed peasants. They thronged in the lobby and tea room of the Duma building. They were willing to talk and who ever wished, could know the minds of the peasants.

So in these two ways the peasant has found his voice and his wishes are plain.

The demands of the peasantry fall into two classes, the basic and unanimous demands and those which are subsidiary or ununanimous.

The basic demands were summed up in the peasant cry, "Land and Liberty."

Land, with the peasant, ranks with air and sunlight. It is a necessity to all and can be owned by none. On this principle they are as nearly agreed as eighty million people could be. Even in those districts where the communal form of holding has died out, or never existed, large numbers of peasants, — legal owners of land, — subscribe to this idea of the un-ownableness of the earth. Now the peasants realize that while there is enough air for everybody to have all he wants, there is not sufficient earth, and so that some sort of organization for the distribution of land must exist. Here again we come to an almost universally accepted principle, — that the land must be held by him who cultivates it with his own hands. All beyond this is matter of detail and of course there is much divergence of opinion, some few accepting the socialistic proposition of central landownership and management, others desire the perpetuation of the existing communal form and some are more closely allied to the Henry George scheme. But all unite again on the principle that these details must be decided locally. So the peasant's theory of land — and it is not a vague theory but the most vital concept in his life — is that: the land can not be owned, it can only be held by him who actually tills it, the details of distribution must be arranged locally.

The peasants demand for liberty is equally concrete. The peasant knows little and cares less about the central government at Petersburg. A great many people have been telling him that he ought to want a democratic republic and he is beginning in a vague way to think so too. But having slight ability to read, what he reads about does not seem half so real to him as what he sees. So his demands are fundamentally local. And when he demands liberty he means local liberty. The peasants who came to the Duma as deputies and those who share the rare gift of reading have a broader conception of liberty but all their political ideas have the local unit for a center and gradually broaden out to national and international affairs. The peasant is fundamentally a federalist. And they are much more concerned with the abolition of tyranny of the local officials than they are with the overthrow of the Tsar. The peasant community is much more democratic in its working than even a Massachusetts town meeting. All they ask of the central government is to keep its hands off their local affairs. This decentralised idea is part of their programme of land distribution. They want the land — all the land — given into the custody of the local committees to be distributed by them. Connected with this demand for Liberty is the demand for an Amnesty of all political prisoners. The peasants

do not always understand the agitators, and are not always understand by them, but they realize in a genral way that the political prisoners were arrested for trying to get "Land and Liberty" for them and therefore are their friends.

The subsidiary demands are manifold and are not so unanimous, principally because the local economic conditions differ widely. The principal ones are liberty of the press, freedom of speech and public discussion, the abolition of the passport system and the right of free change of residence, radical reform in taxation, the reduction of the Army service, Jewish equality and Woman Suffrage. It will be a surprise to many Westerners, who are in the habit of thinking of the Russian peasants as Jew haters, to know that when the subject came up for discussion in the matter of a platform for the labor Group (peasant deputies) in the Duma, the vote in favor of Jewish equality was 96 to 1. The peasants are more ready to give equal political right to the Jews than to their own women. The last demand perhaps being the least unanimous of those I have mentioned.

There is a legend, generally accepted in the West, that the Russian peasants are absolutely unintelligent, very little better than brute beasts. And this popular fable is widely believed by the Russians of the class which calls itself "The Intelligenzia". Because his knowledge of Hegel's philosophy is very limited, because he crosses himself before a holy picture, because his ideas of foreign countries are vague he is supposed to be stupid. And yet I have met a college professor in Moscow all of whose ideas about America were taken from Bryce's "American Commonwealth". He would not believe me when I said that our "primaries" did not work very satisfactorily, — it was all so beautiful according to Bryce. A good many Russian peasants have never heard of America, but nine out of every ten know more about practical, applied democracy than this college professor — or Bryce himself. They are not unintelligent, they are ignorant. One generation of primary education would put them on par with any peasantry of Europe.

A comparison of the demands of the peasants with those of the Intelligenzia is exceedingly interesting. It throws valuable light on the nature and development of the peasant mind. In general the demands of the peasantry are local, practical and definite, while those of the Intelligenzia are general, theoretic and indefinite. The chief interest of the peasant is the raising of a crop—essentially local. The interest of the Intelligenza centers in such things as the organization of commerce and transportation, essentially general. The demands of the peasants are based on their daily life—practical. The College Professor of Economics may have a great deal of information about railroads and industrial organization, but having no practical knowledge of these things his demands will be theoretic. The demands of the peasantry are

concrete and definite. The demands of the Intelligenzia are — if not indefinite — at least abstract. The very definiteness of the peasant's ideas and his methods of attaining them points to a very high degree of intelligence. Modern science is for his method — the inductive rather than the deductive method.

The Intelligenzia get their ideas by abstract logic.

The Peasantry by concrete experience.

No other country has produced a class of such broad cosmopolitan culture as the Russian Intelligenzia. A command of three or four foreign languages — and this coupled with extensive travel — has made them familiar with the literature, philosophy and science of all Europe. And yet their ignorance of the vast majority of their countrymen is appalling. I have in mind a young woman, a university graduate and the daughter of one of Russia's best known educators, who speaks several languages and is a Socialist. She told me that during the last summer she visited friends in the country and attended one of the village meetings. "I couldn't understand what they were talking about," she said, "they speak such bad Russian." This intellectual snobbery is typical of the Intelligenzia. The real Russian language, the speech of ninety percent of the people, is "bad Russian" to the few thousand cultured people who corrupt their language by foreign words and archaic forms. Not understanding the words of the peasants, they pronounce them stupid. It is like the Irish Sergeant in India who accused an intellectual Hindoo of stupidity because he could not say the multiplication table in English.

The evidence of the mental strength of the peasant is too voluminous to cite in detail, and I will only discuss one phase of it — their legal system.

The wisdom of the peasantry is social, rather than individual. It is the aggregate of the mass-mind, not the teachings of individuals. And this is clearly shown in their administration of justice. The Russian peasants have no legend of a law-giver. No Moses or Solon, who, inspired by God, gave them a ready made system of laws. Their law — just grew. The Romans had the Code of Justinian, the French the Napoleonic Code, but in Russia there is — the peasants law.

No other institution so closely reflects the mental development of a people as their judicial system. And in this regard the peasants of Russia have a right to be proud.

The Russians have two words which are translated as "law." "Zakon" meaning an edict or a human law, and "pravda" meaning a natural law, as we speak of a physical or astronomical law. The peasants only use the last word "pravda". Their laws are not written nor formalized,—but live in the minds of the people

as principles of simple justice. Each case is decided on its own merits.

In a class in the New York Law School the Professor was explaining an important decision and one of the students objected.

"Professor," he said, "that doesn't seem just or fair."

"It's the law", the professor replied, cynically, "If you are interested in ethics young man, you had better go to a theological seminary. This is a law-school."

The Russian peasants could not understand that view point. Law to them is nothing but ethics — its only function is to deal out justice. The law being unwritten, there is no "letter of the law" to smother the spirit.

Another point in favor of the peasant system is that it is informal — they have developed no legal caste of lawyers and judges. The judge is elected for three years among themselves. His salary is not sufficient to support him and except on the two or three court days a week, he tills his allotment of land with the rest of them. There is no fear of him, therefore no need of intermediary lawyers. There is no ignorance of the law — because the simple principles of honor and justice are known to all — so here again there is no need of legal specialists.

And the justice of these simple democratic courts is the wonder and despair of the educated. "It is not uniform," they cry out, "You can not tell beforehand what the law is." No. You can not sit down and plan out how to injure and cheat your neighbor to within a hair's breadth of the legal limit, as you can where law is written and administered formally. But unless you try to cheat your neighbors you have nothing to fear.

One instance came to my notice where a dispute between two neighbors ended in a fight and battered faces. They were hailed before the court and after the judge had given them a kindly lecture on brotherly love and pointed out that men had a better way than brute beasts to settle discussions, he sent out for a bottle of vodka and they all shook hands and drank to uninterrupted friendship. It was on the whole a much better, if less classical, solution, than to have perpetrated the ill-feeling by sending the aggressor to jail.

But the most interesting and significant phase of their legal idea is the way they distribute a man's property after death. It is only the land which is held in common and so personal property exists in all other things, horses, farm-implements, animals, etc. Now the law of inheritance has caused the jurists of the world more trouble than anything else. Practically everywhere else the basis of distribution of inheritance is birth. Among the Russian peasants it is labor. The little estate is divided among those who helped to create it, and according to the amount they have helped. If the eldest son has left home early to find fortune in

the city and has led his own life, not contributing to the family purse, he has no claim at its distribution, and the younger sons who have worked side by side with the father will get it all. If, by chance, a son-in-law, has lived in the house and contributed his labor to the family wealth, he shares alike with the sons. This theory of the basis of property right being labor which the peasants have pronounced so forcibly on the land question — runs through their whole life. What a man has made is his.

This — the basic principle of Socialism — is more generally accepted among the Russian peasants than anywhere else in the world.

Almost all these peasants institutions are undergoing a severe strain. Each and all are threatened by the pressure of economic forces or direct governmental interference. The "artel" — the co-operative manufacturing groups — are dying out in competition with the artificially stimulated "Grand Industry." The Government, after years of repressive laws directed against the village communes, has at last abolished them. The police officer stationed in each village often succeeds in corrupting the peasant judge. But the spirit of democratic communism which inspired these institutions is baffled, not killed. The natural social intelligence by which the peasants have developed themselves has been thwarted, not extinguished.

This has been amply demonstrated the few times, when, by some chance, the peasants have freed themselves from the governmental oppression. In December of 1905, the officials were driven away from a half a dozen districts, and until the Cossacks came "to restore order", in many instances, after a space of two months, the peasants governed themselves with a stability and liberality, which was above praise. Some years ago some explorers in Siberia came across an unknown village. Most of the inhabitants were fugitives from the prison camps, but left to themselves they had lived a clean orderly contented life, electing their officials by the simplest democracy and arranging their affairs according to the inherent conception of justice which is part of each Russian peasant's soul. The explorers reported their discovery. And the village was put on the official map. Police came to the village, and priests and prostitutes. Bribery, thievery, army service and all the fruits of civilization were thrust on the villagers. But the explorers had been sufficiently interested in this little "uncivilized" village to write about it at length—and enthusiastically. From their account it is possible to see — with a large degree of accuracy — what Russia will be like when the governmental exploiters are driven out and the peasant can organize things to suit himself.

So much for the description of the peasant's mind and for his needs and his ideals. It is evident, on the face of it, that these demands are revolutionary. No government in the world —

much less the cabal who rule in St. Petersburg — would consent to the nationalization of the land, or to the Socialist doctrine that labor is the only basis of property. In order to realize these demands the peasants will have to fight.

Every Russian newspaper publishes a regular column of "Peasant Disorders", — often several columns. Sometimes the peasants kill the local police master. Sometimes they burn the landlord's barns or cut wood from his park. Sometimes the young men refuse to enter the army. Sometimes it is necessary for the government to flog the villagers to extort taxes. It starts in these ways or some other. Often it is shortlived and put down by the local police, sometimes it is more serious and takes days to suppress. There is very little of the Empire where blood has not flowed from these peasant uprisings. But they have all — sooner or later — been crushed out. The revolt of single villages is hopeless.

We are confronted by the last question: Will the peasants unite in revolt?

If this question could be answered definitely the Bonds of the Russian Government would either spring up way above "par" or sink off the stock exchanges. No one but a prophet could answer this question.

The best that can be done is to cite some of the many forces which draw the peasants together or hold them apart.

The centrifugal forces are appalling.

The expanse of the Empire is so great that unity of action seems impossible. The distances are so vast that half the country is already in the grip of the frost while the shores of the Black Sea are still warm. This difference in season is very grave. If the peasants rise—everyone says—it will be after the harvest. But that time differs by months. Railroads are scant and the telegraph and mail is in the hands of the government. Communication—naturally hard in an undeveloped country—is impeded by police spies. Add to the great distances and the lack of means of communication, the differences in languages, races and customs. The disintegrating force of this social difference is hard for an American to realise. The Dakota woodsman is different from the Alabama cotton raiser, but the difference is gradual, South Dakota differing little from North Dakota, and so on South through Illinois, Tennessee to Alabama. And even the extremes talk the same language. But the difference between Great Russia and little Russia is like the difference between Arizona and Mexico.

All, however, is not so pessimistic. There are centripetal forces as well. The Peasants Union, the Revolutionary Parties, The Labor Group have been ceaselessly preaching united action. They have, as far as possible, overcome the difficulty of distance

and lack of communication. Their proclamations and brochures have been scattered with ceaseless energy. The smuggling in of arms has never before been on so large a scale. In many localities fighting organizations have been formed, and everywhere the most advanced and thoughtful peasants are preparing for a last struggle. Famine and desperation have done much to break down the wall of race difference. Great Russian; Little Russian, Lithuanian, Lett, Armenian, Tartar, all the vast assortment of races are ground down in the same depth of misery. And hunger is more potent than creed or language. Everywhere the agitators report that the peasants want organization and arms, but the workers are few and the money scant, the ground to be covered is vast and the whole force of the government on the alert to impede.

The peasants, like the soldiers, have learned the cost of sporadic revolts. If one travels through Russia and wins the confidence of the peasants, he hears everywhere the same story. "Oh, yes," one peasant told me "our village has revolted — twice".

"What did you do?" I asked.

"Oh, we killed some of the soldiers and took the arms from the rest, we elected our commune and divided up the land."

"What then?"

"After a while, the soldiers came, some of us were killed, some exiled and all of us were flogged."

"Will you revolt again?"

"Oh yes — some time."

"When?"

"When all the peasants do."

Nobody knows just when this will be. But in almost every village in the Empire the peasants are looking forward to this time! The revolts in the past have been bloody lessons, but they have been well learned. They have learned that it is easy to dispose of the soldiers in their locality — it is only the outside troops they must fear. And if all the peasants rise at once and disarm the local forces, there will be no troops left. They have thought it all out in their deliberate, certain way. Of course it will help, if they destroy the railroads. If you ride over the country with an intelligent peasant, he will point out just which bridges will have to be blown up. And as you drive through his village he will point out the police station. "There are twenty rifles there and lots of cartridges", he will say, "some night we will take them. Every morning when I see the police polish them, I laugh, they are keeping the rust off of them—for me." In these words or similar ones the peasants all over the Empire will tell you of their plans. The time will come, they think, when they will all revolt together.

It is only a question of time. This year it may be, or next. I would not be surprised if it started tomorrow.

There is no one organization which has sufficient influence to "call" this simultaneous uprising. The pessimists are correct when they say that the peasants are unorganized. But there is one phase of Russian life which must not be overlooked, and which, to my mind, is full of hope. Time after time psychological waves have swept over Russia and have produced united although unorganized — action.

In the early seventies there was "The Peasantist Movement." Suddenly, without any prearranged plan, it came into the hearts of several thousand young people — all over the Empire — to throw aside their books, to leave their homes and the ease of wealth, to go "to the people". It was an intensified social settlement movement. There was no "Central Committee" back of this movement, no very concrete idea of what was to be done. The educated young people of Russia wanted to know about the peasants. The idea of living among the people was so contagious that family influence, even police persecution, could not restrain this strange crusade. No explanation of this movement is satisfactory. It remains a mystery in spite of many books. It simply happened. But it demonstrated a social solidarity which is quite unknown outside of Russia.

The first general strike shows the same phenomena. It was not organized. It was not "called" by any committee. Ten days, a week, three days before it was an accomplished fact, no one could have foretold it. It came suddenly—without the least preparation. Like a tidal wave it swamped Russian Industrial Life. All at once, everybody stopped work—*at the same time*.

The peasant revolt will come in the same way. The City workmen will help them and so will the revolutionary element of the army and the middle class. And before their simultaneous rising the Autocracy will disappear like a house of cards. Socialization of the land, and local liberty, will be facts. And out of the resulting chaos of burned manor houses and slaughtered officials, some sort of government will take form. And founded as it will be on the democratic and co-operative spirit of these eighty million Russian peasants, it is like to be a government of simple justice and equity, such as this old world has scarcely dreamed of.

ALBERT EDWARD.

The Parlor Socialists.

The designation "parlor" has been attached to those Socialists who are of sufficient importance in the financial and social world to attract to themselves and their movements a considerable degree of publicity. As ordinarily used in the public prints, the phrase carries with it an insinuation of dilettanteism or faddism or oftentimes of downright insincerity.

But there is a deeper significance to the Parlor Socialist, a meaning vastly more profound than the daily newspaper, whose editorials and headlines are written in a hurry to catch the edition, is accustomed to go, even if the average newspaper reader, who is essentially a hasty skimmer, demanded expositions more penetrating and consistent. That is to say, for various complex reasons, more or less familiar, the attitude of the average newspaper, as such, towards current topics is apt to accord very closely with the attitude of the general public toward the same topics. The very existence of a newspaper depends upon an approximate agreement between its views and the views of its reading or advertising patrons, or both.

The general conception of Socialists in this country has been that they are a body of malcontent agitators, with a great preponderance of good-for-nothing aliens, advocating a highly-colored exceedingly fanciful and totally impracticable governmental, economic or industrial scheme. This conception only the most superficial examination can justify. It is not the purpose here however to enter upon an exposition and defense of the principles of Socialism only in so far as it may be necessary to throw light upon the particular phenomenon indicated by the title hereof.

Socialism, as the natural and logical evolutionary successor of capitalism, attracts attention most readily where capitalism has given the greatest evidence of its ill effects and therefore of its decadence; where tyrannous industrial and commercial aristocracies have unmistakably been formed and where class lines are most sharply and indelibly defined. These beginnings are found in the commercial and industrial countries of the old world, most conspicuously in Germany, England, France and Italy. In these countries, class lines have, to be sure, long existed but within the century there has been a change in the color of the chalk with which they were drawn. Formerly in England, merchants and others "in trade" belonged to the lower classes and were generally looked down upon by the landed and hereditary aristocracy. Now however the aristocracy has become largely industrialized while

the lower classes consist almost exclusively of the proletariat, with an admixture of pseudo-bourgeois, leading ever a more precarious and dependent existence, the slaves of the wages system. The temporal power has tended to follow the possessors of wealth, transferring itself to these from the hereditary kings and potentates. The reference is to England because its social fabric is more familiar to American readers. The same is true of the other countries, any difference being one of degree and not of kind.

The industrial development of the United States was no less rapid in the absolute than in those countries but our country, being vast in extent was able to absorb it, and no pressure was felt. Furthermore class lines in this country had to be formed anew rather than merely transformed as in the older countries. But class lines were forming insidiously, even if they were not an easily discernable phenomenon. During the greater part of a half century therefore, while Socialism in Germany was rife, while it was there a leading question exerting an appreciable influence on the government and the laws which all historians recognize, it was in this country taken practically no notice of. When considered at all, it was summarily dismissed as something peculiarly foreign, a product probably of monarchies to disappear with the establishment of a democracy or a republic. This indeed was more than a hasty or superficial view. Even such careful analysts as Henry George and Herbert Spencer speak of Socialism as comparable to the autocracy of Russia. How they reached that conclusion is not clear although it is likely that they mistook for real Socialism the efforts of Bismarck to forestall and impede real Socialism by instituting a modicum of state socialism. They possibly noticed that state socialism was of no benefit to the proletariat and accordingly uttered their comprehensive disapprobation.

At any rate, until the last five years, Socialism received scant notice in this country. News items, much less editorial comment, pro or con, were rare. Magazine articles were rarer, if not entirely absent. During this time and before, there were however the beginnings of Socialism in this country, beginnings which were made largely by immigrants who, being already familiar with the tenets of Socialism, had no difficulty in recognizing its applicability to all countries. Many of our cities had German or Italian Socialist organizations, where a native American Socialist could hardly be found. Even these organizations were few in number and in membership and the average editor passed them by as not worthy of serious academic consideration and as too insignificant to consider from a circulation standpoint. They touched neither his mind, his heart nor his pocketbook.

But what, you ask, has this to do with the Parlor Socialist?.

From the standpoint of America, it has everything to do with him, for the phenomenon which the paragrapher lightly dubs Parlor Socialism is nothing more or less than an unmistakable sign of the Americanization of Socialism, leading the paragrapher gently but powerfully and relentlessly past the point where he can define Socialism as the unintelligible ravings of a handful of unnatural and unnaturalized bomb-throwing aliens plotting against recognized and duly constituted authority. The paragrapher finds plenty of satisfactory reasons for the socialistic product of the German revolution or the German military system without abating one jot or tittle his own intense jingoism, but when he finds men advocating Socialism for this country, men who were born on American soil, bred in American homes, enriched by American methods and educated at American universities, then he grows a little more serious about it, ceases for a moment his strenuous waving of the flag, ponders and possibly evolves a derisive epithet.

Opponents of Socialism frequently say as an objection that there are different kinds of Socialists and different kinds of Socialism. Let them use the following statement as ammunition if they can. There are as many different kinds of Socialists as there are different Socialists. In using that statement however, let them take notice that it is necessarily inconsistent with the "equality of men" theory, an impossible condition which Socialists are often charged with attempting to bring about. There are also varying expressions of the details and ramifications of Socialism, but they all rest on one fundamental principle, the collective ownership and democratic administration of the social tools of production and distribution of wealth. State ownership of railroads in Germany or Russia, for instance, is therefore not Socialism for, while, by an elasticity of meaning, they may be considered as collectively owned, that is, not privately owned, they are certainly not democratically administered.

Socialists who are sincere (for we even recognize that such a thing is possible as an insincere or self-seeking Socialist) are striving for the same goal, their methods, powers, opportunities may and do differ. They may be classified according to any arbitrary standard, color of eyes, mental caliber, material possessions, etc. For the purposes of this paper, it is convenient to divide them, not invidiously, into two classes; the ordinary workman and the "intellectual".

Bearing in mind that no classification is absolute, it may be said in general that the former, the ordinary workman, who is a Socialist is so because his own immediate economic necessities forced him to give it attention. The struggle for existence, in its most virulent form, lies at his very door and he is ready to give ear to any propaganda that promises alleviation. His is the in-

ductive method. That he is likely to be relatively unintelligent, goes without saying! Manifestly he has not had the advantage of a college education, often not even of common schooling. Even the skilled workman has acquired his skill at the neglect of wider intellectual pursuits. Obedient to a specialized brain, his hand performs the work assigned, but he has not been trained to think, to think widely and profoundly, to generalize, to deduce, to follow a consistent and logical abstract mental process. The unskilled workman is still more incompetent mentally. Being an unskilled workman, he often hasn't even the social advantages of the labor union. He must work long hours for small pay. His time, even if he had the inclination to study and the mental capacity to learn readily, will not permit him to do much more than follow the dull and tedious daily round of toiling, eating and sleeping. His whole time, like that of a chicken, is spent in getting a living. To get out of a job is to him often a blessing in disguise, for it gives him time to think.

On the other hand, the intellectuals are Socialists deductively. They are men, not necessarily better men in the absolute, who have had the opportunity to pause for a general prospective and retrospective view, as the traveller pauses at the crest of the hill and contemplates in a large way the road he has just seen in detail as he journeyed over it, and maps out the course ahead of him; or as the traveller lost in the forest climbs a tree to widen his horizon and reestablish his bearings. They have had the advantage of the mental discipline and the introduction to knowledge afforded by the universities. They have had the advantage of access to books, and they have had, most of all, the advantage of leisure, advantages which they have used to their profit. All these advantages presuppose a certain degree of economic security. Although there are men who possess a high degree of knowledge on social and economic subjects and who are yet wage-earning proletarians, they are but the exception which proves the rule. It has been said indeed that many a wage-earner in the slums of New York or Chicago knows more about political economy and sociology than the average college professor. However that may be, the purpose is not to prove that there are not intellectuals among the proletarians, but rather to differentiate the Parlor Socialists as distinctly intellectuals, a differentiation which is obvious. Nor is it by any means contended that all intellectuals are Socialists. Let us examine the Parlor Socialist a little more closely.

He is usually a college graduate. The average college graduate is a hopeful, ambitious lad. If he have sufficient vigor and earnestness of purpose to secure a place among the commencement day orators, he talks about big affairs and electrifies his applauding fellows with glowing idealisms. His gaze is intently

fixed upon the future and in fancy he carves his career and writes his name in bold face type upon the indelible pages of history. He wants to do something. He wants to be something. He has, he thinks, fitted himself for law, journalism, business, politics or what-not. He is ready to take hold.

He knows the Greek and Latin and French verbs. In these languages he has read a few books which he does not remember for their literary or historic value as a whole, but merely fragmentarily as a collection of daily tasks. In the realm of history, he has been dragged through volumes about kings and dynasties and ages which, whether dry-as-dust or served like fiction, have at best but a passing interest for him as no attempt is made to apply this knowledge to his daily life and present problems. He studies political economy and sociology and possibly becomes familiar with a few detached laws like the laws of Gresham and Malthus, but he does not carry away with him a comprehensive grasp of the laws of society, a grasp that in any way will guide him in his daily life. These statements refer of course to the literary or academic institutions. The technological institutions are in a separate category, although it may be remarked in passing that no man is properly educated unless he has a working knowledge of the fundamental laws governing the society in which he lives.

By implication at least, most colleges teach the conservative gospel of things-as-they-are, with respect to politics and economics. At any rate, they do not intimate that a substitute for capitalism is possible or advisable. They do not even recognize capitalism categorically, and Socialism is a matter to be treated in one page out of four hundred of the average economic text-book. It is clear therefore that, while Parlor Socialists are college graduates, the colleges are not directly responsible.

Referring again to the average college graduate, it may be said that he leaves college firm in the determination to "make money" which he frequently confounds with "making a living." And oftentimes he has an additional mental twist to the effect that some ways of making money are more honorable than others. If he is a rich man's son, he goes to college because it is the proper thing to have an unimpeachable certificate of education and, neglecting those sons of rich men who do not make even a pretense of being useful members of society, the majority after graduation proceed in the ways recognized as "proper". If a lawyer, he waits for his client and takes orders whether to stand upon the law or circumvent it; if a minister, he preaches established doctrine; if in mercantile business, he racks his brain to keep up the selling price and keep down the cost price; if a doctor, he humors his patients and gives them what they think they ought to have rather than lose them; if a journalist, he seeks

to discover what the people want him to say and says it; if in public utilities, he contrives to buy legislative bodies and secure franchises as cheaply as possible; if a politician, he joins the more likely of the two dominant political parties and seeks office in the old vote-buying, boss-ridden methods. All these things are eminently proper according to the standards of the day and according to the interests of the class to which he belongs.

He sets about accumulating his automobiles and yachts and town and country houses with as much zeal and energy, yes with as much self-justification, as the proletarian does about getting and holding a job which will yield him hardly sufficient to keep body and soul together. It is the gospel of cut-throat competition. His only limit is "what the traffic will bear". Every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost. It is the recognized gospel and hence eminently proper. The man who sets about to carve his career in any of these fashions stands little chance of being successfully assailed, for the average critic and moulder of public opinion is struck from the same die.

But the Parlor Socialists are different. Their view of life is somewhat more broad. Their methods deviate from the standards called proper. To be called a Parlor Socialist one must of course have large and increasing material possessions. But such a one, although going through the motions of properly taking care of these interests, does not make it his whole business or look upon it as the chief desideratum of life. He wants enough, but he does not want too much and, unlike many of our present-day commercial barons, he conceives that it is possible for an individual to have too much wealth. He pauses to examine the general manner of money-making and weigh it in ethical scales, asking the question as to why he, young and inexperienced, should possess so much without effort while thousands whom he sees about him possess but little or nothing with the maximum of effort. He is led into investigating the sources of wealth and soon comes to the obvious conclusion that wealth is produced by labor and that therefore he is living on the labor of others.

Although he may love ease and comfort, nay although he may be excessively sybaritic, he pauses to witness the despair and wretchedness of those about him and wonders whether it is not possible for all to live in ease and comfort. Although he may love ease and comfort, he does not consider it the part of true luxury to have a half dozen automobiles, to have several different domestic establishments in various parts of the country, to languish at the club or join in the social whirl of gayety and conventional amusement. On the contrary, he reaches the conclusion that true luxury is impossible so long as a large majority of his fellow beings live in squalor and destitution. He is like the good, old-fashinoed housewife who would disdain to sit in a

sumptuous parlor so long as the rest of the house was unkempt. He is a little bit different from the rest of his class. He lives more deeply and thoughtfully than those who are in the conventional rut. He learns more of real life in a year than the goggled speeder can learn in a decade at the automobile lever. But he is not yet a Socialist, except in embryo. He is only a questioner. He has merely become conscious that he is the beneficiary or, if he is particularly harassed by his excessive material possessions, the victim of widespread inequalities.

If he is a man of parts, daubtless, persevering, he will not stop until he gets to the bottom of the question. He examines first this explanation, then another; now this remedy, now that one. Beginning with the general prejudicial contempt for Socialists and Socialism, he finally recognizes that the social disease he is fighting is systematic and organic and that Socialism and Socialists offer the only systematic remedy.

At this point, another and entirely different quality is requisite. The recognition of the fact is one thing. To make public that recognition is quite another, requiring a kind of nerve or heroism of which story books are wont to prate, a heroism more traditional than historical, more desired than possessed. He has found that society is divided into two classes, one small one preying on the other large one. He has found that he belongs to the preying class which is as jealous of its prey as the dog of its meagre bone. To announce his conviction involves the possible disavowal of the social ties of a life time and even of the family ties. He must place himself in opposition to the views of his entire class and attract to himself the heedless bark of every feist that turns a stilted phrase or wields a dogmatic pen. Having become conscious of the existence of classes, he is opposed to class lines and becomes a traitor, so-called, to his own class. He believes that society should be a homogeneous, harmonious whole, instead of two opposing forces deployed in battle array upon the industrial arena. So believing and having the courage of his convictions, he joins hands with those of the other class who are likewise class-conscious and protestant.

We have been taught to sing of "Hands Across the Sea". This is hands across the social chasm joining in an attempt to heal the breach made by the unsocial ravages of capitalism. A slight recapitulation will clarify the figure. The proletariat, the exploited wage slave, becomes conscious of the chasm, makes his examination and espouses Socialism. This after a time attracts the attention of now and then a truth-seeking member of the other class. He looks and "lo, it is good" and they join hands, marking the advent of the intellectuals into the movement.

The introduction of the Parlor Socialist into the American movement therefore is truly and deeply significant. It is a

critical moment calling for more serious consideration and discussion than contemptuous or derisive innuendo in the form of fantastic epithet, can satisfy. Nor can it be satisfied in the way of which the following is a fair example. "Millionaire Socialist So-and-so To Live In A Hut", says a newspaper headline. The statement not being true, we may assume an ulterior motive besides the mere desire to give the news. We may assume that the headliner believes that Socialists should live in huts and he is anxious to disseminate Socialist So-and-so's apparent sanction of that belief. To tell him in general that Socialists, far from desiring to live in huts, however better they may be than some tenements, believe that with an equitable distribution of wealth no man would need to live in a hut, makes no impression upon him. To tell him specifically that his story is untrue, elicits the charge that Socialist So-and-so therefore is not sincere. If Socialist So-and-so is not going to live in a hut, wear rags and dine with the Barmecides, he is not a true and faithful Socialist, the newspaper headliner's conception being so vague that he confuses the desire to relieve the destitution of the proletariat with the desire to share his destitution and privations. He believes that Socialist So-and-so should sell all he has and give it to the poor. In vain does the Socialist protest that such a proceeding is utterly futile, that charity is but a poor substitute for justice, that to give to the poor reduces them to state of mental dependence, lowers their wages and offers another source of gain to some capitalist leech. And so the newspaper headliner merely corrects himself in some subsequent issue by the derisive declaration that Socialist So-and-so has decided that he will forego hut-living and other asceticisms.

Or perhaps the newspaper headliner is merely reasoning by analogy, always a most dangerous logical process. Perhaps, consciously or otherwise, he draws an analogy from the two dominant parties, formed of leaders and followers, parlor office-holders and kitchen voters, leaders who promise nothing but buncombe and give nothing but excuses, sympathetic plutocrats who give just enough "to the cause" to get the required votes and protect their vested interests, their followers riding in carriages on election day to walk the rest of the year. Perhaps he cannot conceive how a party can be organized on any other basis, how a man with money could have any other reason for dabbling in active politics at all, much less in a form of politics where all are on equality and the leader is but a follower.

The story of the man who was arrested for keeping a vicious dog is a familiar one. He defended himself on three grounds: in the first place, his dog was not vicious, in the second place, he always kept his dog muzzled and, in the third place, he didn't have any dog in the first place. Our case is similar. The Parlor

Socialist as a class after all does not exist. A Socialist is one who believes that the wage system is slavery; that competition is wasteful; that special statutory privilege of any kind is unsocial and immoral. He believes he has found a definite, simple remedy in the collective ownership of the social tools of production and distribution of wealth. He denies governmental favors to others and asks them not for himself. The Parlor Socialist advocates these things to his own material disadvantage, thus refusing sustenance to the popular gospel that a plethora of material wealth is the *summum bonum*. But he does not advocate them to his own economic insecurity for, of the economic security he seeks to obtain for all, he will himself partake.

Parlor Socialism as a characterization is ephemeral. It will disappear when the Socialist movement is thoroughly Americanized, that is, when the Parlor Socialists are sufficiently numerous to cease to invite individual comment and when, through the lapse of time, they have given unmistakable evidence that they are not merely victims of a passing fad or fancy.

ELLIS O. JONES,
950 Madison Ave., Columbus, O.

The Intellectuals and Working Class Socialism.

(Continued).

THE passage from the old to the new regime is to be made by transitional measures which show how our utopian understands the functioning of the government of Intelligence. Saint-Simon has given several sketches of these measures. The fullest of these was explained in his work entitled "L'Organisateur". There is to be a parliament with three Chambers, which might be quite acceptable to royalty. The first is to be the *Chamber of Invention*, composed of two hundred civil engineers fifty poets or writers, twenty-five painters, fifteen sculptors or architects, ten musicians; its function will consist in developing plans for national works and public feasts. The second is to be called the *Chamber of Examination*; it will comprise a hundred physiologists, a hundred physicists, a hundred mathematicians. It will control the projects developed by the former Chamber and will direct public instruction. The third or *Executive Chamber* will be that where the manufacturers "adjusting ideas to production will judge what is immediately practicable in the projects of public utility conceived and elaborated in concert by the scientists and artists".

In later projects Saint-Simon more modestly limits himself to increasing the powers of the Institute and of the scientific societies. He proposes to develop the Academy of Sciences, to create a vast Academy of moral sciences and place over both these bodies a supreme scientific College.

To realize this oligarchical society Saint-Simon does not count on persuasion. He condemns popular violence with a vigor which could not but enchant our present reformists. He was obliged, he says in his *New Christianity*, "to take all necessary precautions to prevent the spread of the new doctrine from impelling the poor class to acts of violence against the rich and against governments. I have been obliged" he adds, "to address myself in the first place to the rich and powerful that I might dispose them favorably to the new doctrine by making them feel that it was not contrary to their interests, since it was evidently impossible to improve the moral and physical condition of the poor class by other means than those which tend to increase the enjoyments of the rich class. I have been obliged to show the artists, the scientists and the men in charge of the manufacturing industries, that their interests were essentially the same as

those of the mass of the people, that they belonged to the class of toilers, while at the same time they were their natural leaders. Likewise, in 1821, in his *Lettre a M. M. les Ouvriers* Saint-Simon had advised the latter to speak only with words of humility to their employers: "You are rich", they were to say, "and we are poor; *you work with the head and we with our arms*; it results from these two fundamental differences which exist between us that we are and ought to be your subordinates."

But—and this is still a common trait with our present priests of reason and science—Saint-Simon asks the help of the authorities in his persuasive propaganda and for the realization of his projects. All his life he implores an intervention from above, addressing himself in turn to Napoleon, to the Tsar, to the parliaments of France and of England, to Louis XVIII, to the Holy Alliance, to the bourgeois classes. His idea is to draw from the coercive power of the State all the action which the idealists expect from it for imposing their dreams. He hopes that the king will operate with a high hand to apply his plans. He suggests the proclamation of a dictatorship until the reorganization of the nation be complete. Several times he advises to act brusquely, and he does not hesitate to demand as tyrannical measures as those of the Revolution.

Is it not right that Force should serve the Idea?

IV.—Saint-Simon's School carries out the system to its logical conclusions and ends in an intensified *intellectual despotism*.

Grouped at first around his paper *Le Producteur*, it announces that it is about to bring humanity back to *dogmatism*, "the normal state of the human intelligence, that to which it tends continually by its nature and in all of its types". The famous distinction established by Saint-Simon between critical epochs and organic epochs forms the "scientific and experimental basis" of his new theocratic conception. Does not historical observation show that humanity is on the threshold of a new organic period? And is it not manifest that the time is come for society to tear itself away from individualism, disorder and competition, that it may realize association, order and harmony? All that is needed is to find the *government* adequate to the new epoch.

This is the problem which Saint-Simon's genius has solved. But that there may be a perfect *unity* in the hierarchy he has constructed it is necessary to go to the end and give a religious foundation to the new order. Science and religion blend together in positive philosophy. Irreligion is peculiar to critical epochs; organic periods are periods of faith. Now the new faith exists: it is *demonstrated truth*. And this faith, precisely because it is "Founded on demonstration instead of tradition", is the most scientific which can be imagined.

But every religion implies a pope. If the priest and the

scientist are one and guide society in the way of reason, they must themselves drink in from a higher source the truth which they diffuse in the world. Among all the priests of the new social order there is one specially chosen for this sovereign mission. Because, nearer to God, he knows more than the others, he must reveal to them the exigencies of the eternal order. By him cohesion will be complete in the harmonic society where all shall depend on his authority and where there shall be no more room for liberty, unreason and anarchy.

"Papacy", says Enfantin, "is a divine conception: it is perfect, since it is the image of unity."

In this sacerdotal society justice is to be distributed proportionately to capacity. The old aristocracy was founded on the *privilege of births* the new will be created on the *privilege of capacity*. "To each according to his ability, to each ability according to its deeds". Such is the formula which the School wishes to carry over into reality. It is this which inspires to-day our professional intellectuals, when they demand a just—that is to say a large — *reward for talent*.

In the *Globe*, the School of Saint-Simon defines its practical immediate demands. It gives more methodically than Saint-Simon all the recipes for State socialism. Its chief concern is to make of the State "the first of bankers, the depository and disburser of the national capital to the poor intellectuals. The necessary resources will be provided by the suppression of collateral inheritance and by a graduated succession tax. But the State will not realize its aim completely until it becomes a great employer on public works and develops its national machinery, canals, roads, railroads, banks, etc. It must organize high schools for the training of engineers, directors of industry, in a word, all "the officers of the peaceful army of laborers."

For, indeed, it is really on the military fashion that the Saint-Simonians conceive their society as operating. They quarrel with the army only because it is intended for making war. Some of them even think of utilizing it for the industrial organization. Does it not represent authority, hierarchy, order, everything which should characterize the new world? Listen to Michel Chevalier: "The regiments with their uniform, their music, their religion of the flag, would then become great schools of arts and crafts where the toilers would find a precious fund of honorable sentiment and of punctual habits". Elsewhere he compares the engineers and the laborers to officers and soldiers. He thus represents the inauguration of great works which he proposes for the transformation of Paris: "The king and his family, the court of appeals, the royal court, the two Chambers, would handle the pick and shovel, the old Lafayette would be there, the regiments and the music... the squads of workmen would be commanded by

engineers and experts in full uniform.. the most brilliant women would move among the workmen to encourage them."

It is easy to understand the mental traits from which this theocratic and despotic conception of society must have arisen. As Dupin said to the Chamber, speaking of the Saint-Simonians: "They would make of society a vast convent, whose chiefs, under the name of capacities, should be the monks, and whose members, under the name of laborers, should be the penitents". The rival socialist sects were no more merciful. Considerant especially pronounced on the School one of the truest judgments which it has called out: "Carried away," he said, "by the defense of the principle of authority and by the study of the feudal and theocratic organizations of the Middle Ages it takes for a solution an impossible historical revamping. This consisted in applying to the data of the new society, industry and labor, the hierarchy which the old society had made for war, that is to say, that feudal form and theocratic hierarchy itself. And even the old Saint-Simonian Vidal, while he still congratulated his former teachers for having wished to "rehabilitate the idea of authority, order and hierarchy", accused them of "committing a strange anachronism". "It is in vain", he said, "to invoke history, to say that everything great in the world has always been accomplished by despotism, religious or military. It may be answered with the same authority: But also all crimes against humanity have been committed in the name of fanaticism or in the name of tyranny."

This taste for authority, moreover, led the School to the rapt adoration of every strong authority. Enfantin, like Saint-Simon before him, had been a devoted worshiper of Napoleon I and he became one of the warmest partisans of Napoleon III. But it is especially in their admiration for the Austria of Metternich, petrified in dogma, hardened in absolutism, that all the theocratic passion of the Saint-Simonians is revealed. In his sonorous *Letter to Heine*, Father Enfantin awaits from Austria the regeneration of Germany. "In her", he cries, "is deposited German morality, the life of the Holy Empire. She is the depository of order, hierarchy, the sentiment of duty." He speaks again elsewhere of the "touching beauty of Austria, calm and harmonious in the midst of the discords of the world.

While this madness for authoritarianism possessed the principal leaders of the Saint-Simon School to the end of their career, they always remained equally anxious to assure the best possible means of keeping the ranks of the intellectual aristocracy recruited. Enfantin at his death bequeathed to his friends the mission of realizing his two last thoughts: the publication of an Encyclopedia and the organization of the *Credit Intellectuel*, (Intellectual Trust Company). The one was to serve as a foundation for the other. The encyclopedic institute was not merely to be

a vast literary enterprise, but it was to facilitate the organization of an intellectual trust company. Loans were to be made to poor young men on the security of their ability. The need was recognized of raising capital for science as for industry; we have an Exchange of values, there should be an Exchange for ideas. Thought should be quoted on this Exchange the same as sugar and cotton and be the object of the same financial speculations. Enfantin considers that the capitalists who will float the affair will make their profit out of it, but he appeals especially to their feelings: "I have cited numerous examples", he writes, "of the inhuman carelessness of our present society as regards the throng of its children endowed with intelligence and abandoned by it at the time when they have the greatest need of its natural provision.... And has not Saint-Simon bequested to posterity and especially to us this terrible cry:" For two weeks I have eaten bread and drunk water! The names of the toilers in science and art are not yet inscribed on the books of the Bank and the bankers; credit exists not for them; it is for you to give it to them. When you shall have accomplished this work not only shall we see no more poets or scientists like Gilbert in the hospital, but you will not longer have to blush for the scandalous failings of men of genius. Credit makes people moral". And Enfantin points out the precautions to take. "You will say perhaps that intellectual credit is very uncertain, I affirm that it is not. Take the same precautions which the banks of Scotland take for personal credit: two witnesses of the same profession, or else a guarantor, and add, as completely moralizing, a life insurance policy. I tell you that this will be quite as good security as the two signatures which are sufficient for bankers who deal with manufacturers. Scientists, poets, literary men, artists, these are a numerous and noble clientage; for it is they who cultivate, embellish and enrich the world of the mind; it is they who should have their turn to-day, after the material miracles which have been realized in industry." Finally, Enfantin ends by raising the threatening specter of a discontented intellectual proletariat. "It is certain that society suffers morally from the inequality of the distribution of the fruits of labor between capital and talent, between the sated flesh and the hungry soul. Human intelligence is no longer Christian enough to glory in its mortifications and its misery: it is jealous of its glorious sister, and she may indeed suffer cruelly for it unless she takes precautions."

All the "demands" of the poor intellectuals, whose talents are misunderstood, or whose genius is unrecognized, which we have heard so often in our own days, are there set forth with an abundance of arguments which will never be surpassed. Truly, under whatever form we take it, Saint-Simonism appears as the ideal socialism of the professionals of thought.

V.—Saint-Simonism occupies a preponderant place in the history of the ideas of the nineteenth century and its influence has persisted up to our time. The religious and fantastical aspects of the doctrine quickly faded away and, in that sense, Proudhon could truthfully say that "the Saint-Simonians have passed away like a masquerade". But the real and vital things in the School have shown good staying qualities: scientific rationalism, State socialism and the dominance of the intellectuals.

It may be said that with the Saint-Simonian School we have a beginning of this vicious use of words: positive science, experimental truth, rational demonstration, scientific observation, etc. expressions which no doubt have a real meaning when properly employed, but which become deceptive when in the service of the superstition of abstract science. Positivism—at least that which is vulgarized as positivism—is its most extreme form, and Renan says, not without reason, of August Comte: "M. Comte believes that humanity feeds exclusively on science, or, what shall I say? on little ends of phrases like the theorems of geometry, arid formulas". Hereafter we shall have to suffer the lawless manifestations of this *rationalistic craziness* which claims to drive the unforeseen from history and chance from the world, which would dissipate obscurity in everything and reduce everything to intelligible and clear concepts; and which proposes to impose upon the universe, always tormented by desire for the irrational, the laws of formal science.

Saint-Simonism is the first of those scientific utopias born of the progress of practical knowledge and mechanical inventions. The human mind, intoxicated with its own conquests over nature, easily believes that nothing is impossible for it and embarks upon the most foolish enterprises. The Fouriérist dream of transforming the moon, and that is not the least of their vagaries. And we all know to what aberrations of intelligence the education called scientific has so often led its unhappy victims.

But it is in the socialism of political parties that the most persistent of the Saint-Simonian conceptions are reborn. At first there is a bunch of formulas currently employed by the socialist reformers who come from this School:—"The amelioration of the moral, physical and intellectual lot of the most numerous and the poorest class". "The end of the exploitation of man by man." "The golden age which a blind tradition has hitherto placed in the past is before us,"—etc. Later it is this School which inaugurated that reaction, which the socialist parties have continued, against the economic individualism of the French Revolution with a cry for solidarity and intervention. From this School date the anti-revolutionary theories of *social evolution*, which teach that the passage from one social form to another is made by an insensible progression; and it is from this School

again that come also these appeals to the reasonableness of the ruling classes, which have so often been formulated since, to accomplish peacefully in *collaboration* with the exploited classes the urgent reforms.

Moreover, at the very moment when this school was being wrecked by its ridiculous eccentricities, its ideas were taking form in rival systems. The State socialism of Louis Blanc is closely allied to the State absolutism of the Saint-Simonians. Pecqueur and Vidal have the same authoritative conception of collectivism or communism. And they all would unite, in a general and peaceful reconciliation, the enlightened bourgeoisie and the confident proletariat.

All the demands of State socialism in Europe will be found to flow from Saint-Simonism. Charles Andler in his study on *Origins of State Socialism in Germany*, has observed how heavily the Saint-Simonism ideas have weighed on the German social thought, and how from Lassalle to Rodbertus and the social monarchy, it is the spirit of this School which has been manifested. And we only need to state that the Lassallean conceptions inspire to-day all the socialist parties in the world—conceptions which have stateism as their beginning and their end—to grasp under its present appearances the permanence of the most dogmatic and most authoritarian of doctrines.

But the real success of the School was the troop of bankers and manufacturers which it gave to capitalism carried away by the intoxication of its first audacity. The great names of finance, of political economy, of business practice, were Saint-Simonian names. Here especially we see the affinities of the utopia with the environment which produced them. The Saint-Simonian dream of putting men of thought at the head of our industrial society has been realized. A few decades have sufficed to turn France upside down, to checker it with railroads and canals, to equip it with establishments of credit and speculation, to make it, in a word, a country of great capitalism.

It will be understood that a doctrine thus made for the *masters of production* does not become popular. It touched only the intellectuals, to whom it was addressed. The proletariat could hardly understand that hierarchic and theocratic conception of life. To have the *secret of the people*, as Corban says, it will be necessary to question it and, without taking account of outside infiltrations, discover what there is in it irreducible and new.

HUBERT LAGARDELLE.

(Translated by Charles H. Kerr.)

(To be continued.)

Capitalist Science.

IN "American Medicine" for April '07, the Editor greatly worried over the negro-lynchings in the Southern States, asks: "Why does the free negro show such "irresistible impulse" to rape white women, while the slave did not? There must be a discoverable and removable cause. It is a question for science and not theology or pedagogy."

And having found the proper method of handling this annoying question, the editor at once outlines a bold plan of treatment: "The negro brain", he cites, "is considerably smaller than the European and particularly the northern types grouped together as Anglo-Saxon The negro not only has fewer brain cells, but also fewer of those connecting fibres, which by their number distinguish the human from all other brains The near brain is well developed so that the negro is emotional His brain shows why he lacks self-control under provocation, and why his sensual acts normal to the jungle, are uncontrollable in civilization. As the negro inferiority is not functional, accidental, but due to an organic defeat of the brain it follows "that no amount of training will cause that brain to grow into the Anglo-Saxon form."

Hence, of course, it is a great calamity that "we placed a vote in the possession of his brain which can not comprehend its use." And . . . "it may be practicable to rectify the error and remove a menace to our prosperity—a large electorate without brains It is high time to call in anatomy to the aid of statesmanship Science may show where the trouble lay, and point the way to some practicable scheme for limiting the franchise to those who can use it, and disfranchizing those who abuse it or sell it

The medical profession has a ground opportunity to help stem the tide of civic corruption which is overwhelming the nation. We are reaping a harvest of crime from our neglect to cultivate this field.

Pedagogs and clergymen have assured us that education and religion will cure our civil ills. Yet we have the worst record of any civilized nation, in spite of the most extensive school system and our well known piety."

The throne had remained kingless for more than a century. The gods were forced out of the temple in this age of scrutiny and challenge. But now the young knight—Science—virile and daring—demands for itself the authority of both, throne and altar.

It reaches out for the Universe as its kingdom. It presumes to dictate the way you shall cloth, house, live and die. It will command whether you shall marry and rear the like of you, or whether you shall have to stay single, as none of your like are wanted.

And to cap the climax of its audacious demands, science now claims as its function to decide whether or not a mortal be allowed to exercise his right of a free man, his right to vote.

It may be that the demand of science will have to be acceded to. It may be that the scientific way, the anatomical way, will prove the best, the wisest way, that human genius will ever learn to employ; perhaps it will be so, at some future day. Would it be wise for humanity to trust it, life and liberties, to the decision of the anatomist, or medical man of to-day—this is quite a different question.

Time there was when the scientists and doctors formed a class by themselves, living on the outskirts, so to say, of the ordinary struggle for life; where, serving humanity, they were not called upon to participate in the war between exploiter and exploited. They served man as man, and in this noble vocation have developed tendencies and instincts of their own, which crystallized into a code of ethics that walled in the medical profession into a caste dissimilar to any other civil class or caste. The doctor or scientist knew no authority superior to science, no power above truth. Money, fees, remunerations; the amount of these have been established by common usage, for the doctor, too, must live.

But the fee was the last, and the prompt and conscientious aid to the sufferer preeminently the very first consideration of the doctor. Verily his word could have been taken, as the word of truth itself; and the clauses of the Hippocratic oath that say: "Into whatever house I enter, I will go into them for the benefit of the sick With purity and with holiness I will pass my life and practice my art . . ." were by no means mere words, but presented a true image of the soul of the practitioner of the Medical Science and art in days gone by.

But capitalism came. Under no other form of society was money-hunger so deeply and so universally rooted into the human heart.

Has the doctor been exempt, did he save his holy scroll, his ethics, his honor and his superiority over man in his strife?

Let facts speak for themselves.

Professor Koch, the famous physician, to whose work we owe a great part of what we know about Tuberculosis, announced to the world in an article in the "*Deutsche Medicinische Wochenschrift*" of April 1st '97, that he had discovered a new, Tuberculin—that is a remedy for the cure of consumption—(a former similar

discovery by him having turned out more or less useless), the article peculiarly being dated November 14, '96.

A controversy as to the merits of the works of Professors Koch and Buchner, arose immediately, and not only suggested that plagiarism was not altogether inapplicable to the state of affairs, but brought out also the fact, that both professors, believing their discoveries to be of the greatest value to suffering humanity, held them back for months attempting meanwhile to secure patents, and thereby more profitably to exploit their supposed specific remedies.

About a year ago the world was rejoiced and at the same time shocked, when Professor Behring, I believe, announced that he discovered a specific remedy for the White Plague, but would withhold its formula until he was enabled to accumulate so and so many millions of dollars!

Such is the change capitalism wrought on some of the pillars of the medical profession in the Old World.

How about America?

Let us turn to our own community.

A few years ago an old man died under suspicious circumstances. Another man was arrested under the charge of having caused said man's death by poison.

The state hired medical experts, who at the trial proved that the deceased died of poison; the defendant hired medical experts who proved that said deceased might have died of any known disease but poison.

And to this day the question has not been definitely settled; for although the State still holds the prisoner ready for execution, only a few months ago some prominent medical men started circulating, among the medical profession, a petition for the release of the unfortunate prisoner; for these medical petitioners claim that the deceased did not come to his demise through poison.

Now the discovery of poison in a case like the above, depends upon a very definite and rather simple procedure, which would never cause differences of opinion among chemists, if an opinion were dependent merely upon the interpretation of a chemical reaction, and not upon the heart rending fact, that a big fee will or will not be paid, according to the results of the finding.

A short while ago, a millionaire took the law into his own hands and fired a bullet into the body of another man, with fatal effect. The shooter was arrested. At the trial the prosecutor claimed that the accused man was sane, consequently punishable; counsel for defendant claimed that said defendant was insane, consequently not punishable.

The prosecutor hired medical experts who learnedly proved that the defendant was sane. The defendant hired medical ex-

perts who equally learnedly went on proving that their employer was insane.

And there the question stands to-day.

Now, the question of whether a person is, or is not sane is surely more complicated, and more difficult of solution than the question of whether there is or there is not any poison in a given stomach.

Still such questions, relating to sanity and insanity are being answered by experts daily without great ado, whenever a large fee does not come with the way the answer of the expert, goes.

There is scarcely a man in this land who does not know the meaning of the word "Patent Medicine".

It is a mixture of medicinal ingredients, patented under the laws of the state, the formulae being kept secret. It is compounded and pushed by medical men and chemists. It is advertised loudly as a sure cure, usually for some incurable disease, as cancer, consumption, or blindness. It is absolutely useless, as far as the accomplishment of the promised cure. But most of the time it contains a large amount of alcohol, morphine or cocaine, which by temporary stimulation produce a sense of buoyancy which the unfortunate victim mistakes for the curative effect of his secret nostrum; he continues imbibing it until his original trouble becomes complicated by chronic alcoholism, cocaineism or morphinism.

In this manner hundreds, nay, thousands, of the most unfortunate, are being robbed, and under the false promise of a cure that is impossible are the more quickly hurried to their death instead of having the fatal end delayed.

It is true that these patent-medicine men are the traitors to the medical profession, the quacks, the charlatans; those who yield to Mammon without the least show of resistance; but, it is true also, that never before capitalism did such a large percent of physicians desert the ranks, as is witnessed to-day.

However many, or few—these are the outcasts, of the honorable pharmaceutical and medical professions, and pointing to the yearly slaughter produced by the patented drugs the regulars of these professions may rightly say: "Our hands have not spilled that blood!"

I would not like in the same breath to mention the patent-man, with the sins of omission and commission chargeable to many of the regulars. But the regulars are not all clean either.

There is a book known as the "National Formulary", containing many recipes of great usefulness for certain ills that flesh is heir to. Now some "reputable houses", pick out some such recipes, alter them slightly or nothing at all, label them with fancy name, and put them on the market at fancy prices. And some *regular*, mark you, regular professor, stops to push those

brazen-faced imitations of well known formulae and dump them into the sick-room and hospital at their extremely high prices.

As example I will mention at random two such preparations: Cataplasma Kaolini, is a well known salve, very useful and rather cheap.

Liquor Antisepticus Alkalinus is a beautiful fluid preparation that has certain curative power under certain conditions and is very cheap besides.

Now, certain respectable houses have put on the market imitations of the above, that have absolutely no greater healing power than druggist, doctor or patient could discover, and such imitations sell at 3, 4 or even 5 times the price the decent well known pharmacopoeial preparations can be bought.

And *regular professors* push those shameful impositions, and regular and respectable physicians have got to follow suit.

Now, some of the above named concerns boast that their products are being sold by the tons to the city hospitals. Of course even respectable houses are not compelled neither by laws nor otherwise to stick in their statements to the absolute truth, but you cannot help asking: suppose this particular boast does contain some truth, and the city is being taxed to pay 300 percent over the real value for drugs supplied to the poor sick in the public institutions—and such taxation made possible by a little graft distributed to the proper person, which in many instances must be a regular medical man of the better class. Then such would be the depth to which a medical man can sink and still remain a regular. It does not quite harmonize with the language of the Hippocratic oath.

But, strange to say, such conduct under capitalism might be called with propriety "business methods" and would not at all be out of tune with the notions of right and wrong, as the world understands such notions now, under capitalism. And the average citizen, and many a doctor, while not approving, would fail to see in it any thing particularly revolting.

A few weeks ago the street cleaners of New York quarrelled with their chief, he having introduced a custom of fining them out of a considerable portion of their wages upon the merest pretext.

It was the hottest week of the summer. The chief, an employee, of the tax-payers, did not hasten to adjust matters so as not to leave his employers in the lurch, but high-handedly provoked a strike. The street cleaners ceased to collect and remove the garbage.

In three days the offal accumulated in mounds on every sidewalk, and the smell rose to the heart of heaven. How many young children were choked to death; how many sick, struggling with death had the balance turned against them, just by the eman-

ations of the fast decomposing animal refuse, will never be known. If these "christian" "gentlemen" who forced the strike will ever read a judgement-book, they may find it there. It was evident that the health of the strongest and the lives of the weaker ones were seriously threatened.

And still the "respectable" news papers had found out experts who declared to them that the accumulated decomposed garbage is only disagreeable on account of its odor; but that there really was no danger at all to health or life. These experts were so cited at that particular time by the "Times" and "Globe" for instance, for the purpose of quieting popular indignation, which if roused, might have forced the public officials to end the strike not entirely on their own terms.

But if the citizens would ask why they should be taxed yearly to the tune of so many millions of dollars for the removal of garbage that is merely malodorous, those very experts and those very "Times" and "Globe" would have no difficulty in proving that the accumulation of garbage is not only malodorous, but also breeding a fearful number of deadly infections diseased, citing a host of authorities to prove their point.

We had the Haywood trial. Class was arraigned against class as openly, as is witnessed but seldom. The socialists and the more intelligent workingmen insisted on their right to hold their comrades innocent until proved otherwise, and fearing the repetition of the Chicago outrage of 20 years ago, organized demonstrations to secure a fair trial, and a fair charge by court.

The capitalists, assured contrary to law, that Haywood was guilty,—indeed—some of them in spite of the verdict—still announce their such unchanged belief and treated Haywood from the start as law would not allow them to treat even an escaped convict.

At the trial the veracity of the statements made by the psychopathological monstrosity, known under the name of Orchard, was naturally of great importance. Science assumed the part of an overzealous servant of the dominant class, taking as its cue the shout and clamor of the blood-thirsty wealthy mob; science came to the rescue in the person of Professor Munstenberg, who after a superficial farcical examination announced Orchard to be a truth-telling man.

I could enlarge upon the difficulties, inherent and organic, to scientifically demonstrate whether a story told by a normal subject, is truth, or mere "embroidery".

I could step by step show how the difficulties increase to an unanswerable enigma when the story, the veracity of which is to be scientifically demonstrated, is told by an Orchard, i. e. by one that is vitally interested, has been presumably, amply and ably tutored, and is a rare pathological monster at that.

But I shall not enter into a discussion of these details,—for the professional exhibition of himself was so superlatively clownish, that to-day, at least it calls for no serious criticism, except, perhaps, from the professors own colleagues, who may feel incensed at this public degradation of science by one of its priests.

And yet this clownish performance, meant, at a certain critical period, that science demanded the life of a man, that was perfectly innocent, as the verdict of the jury has shown beyond doubt.

The professor claims that he was not paid for what he has done; he wants us to believe him; why should he? why rather not show his wonderful power and use his peculiar scientific methods, and *prove* beyond the cavil of doubt that he is truth telling.

He wants us to believe him; why should we? why should we be charitable to the man that is now trembling because he failed to hang an innocent man, and who would be glorifying now, if Haywood were strangled? How can the world charitably believe the professor who fears that he perchance may loose his standing in the community; while this very professor had no charity toward an innocent man on trial for his life? Are men, that voluntarily step out of their way to help hang an innocent fellow being, are such men believed, patted, shown charity?

Is this the science he learned? Is that the psychology he knows? is that the conduct he observed all throughout christian capitalist civilization?

But where the professor himself landed would be of no moment; the important fact is that he and his science can not be divorced in the popular mind, and the discredit of one is necessarily shared by the other.

About 100 years ago, a famous general announced that he learned by experience that providence was usually found on the side that had the better guns. Repeated experiences to-day have taught the nation, that the expert scientists' opinion was usually found on the side that had to pay the fattest fee. Such is the position to which science under the influence of the capitalistic atmosphere has been brought by some of its accredited representatives; until you will to-day find no jury that would, upon mere scientific testimony, hang even a cat if there was a possibility that such hanging would imply a fee to the concerned scientific expert.

And to science under such influence and such representation the "American Medicine" would have the nation refer for a decision of its most cherished and most sacred privilege!

To settle questions of right and wrong by the drawn sword is unjust, inhuman, and cruel: It is Hell. But if humanity would

have to choose between cruel war and the decision of modern scientific expert testimony, humanity guided by common sense, would choose the lesser evil of the two: it would draw the sword.

Undoubtedly science will eventually guide all human activity, it will, as it should.

But as long as the majority of the race are economically dependent upon the few "captains" of industry, and insecure even in their temporary state of dependence, constantly facing the probability of sinking even to a lower degree; as long as this condition lasts—no man will dare express a free independent opinion, and the scientific expert, being as dependent as the rest, will prove no exception.

Only when the land and means of production are owned by the community, which will recognize every citizens inalienable right to equal partnership, then only will people have no necessity and no motive for hiding, or crippling their views and believes, and then only will we have a science, by which humanity will be willing to be guided; to which humanity confidently and safely will be able to entrust the construction of a code of conduct for both, the individual, and the community.

Then and only then will humanity be enabled to listen with due respect to the word of science; then and only then, and never before.

DR. ADAM ISRAELI.

Marx's Historical Method.

' The mode of production of the physical means of life dominates as a rule the development of the social, political and intellectual life.

Karl Marx.

I.

THE SOCIALIST CRITIQUES.

Marx, half a century ago, proposed a new method for the interpretation of history, which he and Engels have applied in their studies. It is not surprising that the historians, sociologists and philosophers, fearing lest the communist thinker corrupt their innocence and cause them to lose the favors of the bourgeoisie, should ignore this method; but it is strange that socialists hesitate to employ it, possibly for fear of arriving at conclusions which might rumple their bourgeois notions, to which they unconsciously remain prisoners. Instead of experimenting with it so as to judge it from its use, they prefer to discuss the question of its value and they discover innumerable defects in it; it misconceives, they say, the ideal and its operation; it brutalizes eternal truths and principles; it takes no account of the individual and of his role; it leads to an economic fatalism which excuses man from all effort, etc. What would these comrades think of a carpenter who, instead of working with the hammers, saws and planes put at his disposal, should quarrel with them? Since no perfect tools exist, he would have plenty of chance to rail at them. Criticism does not begin to be fruitful instead of futile, until it comes after experience, which, better than the most subtle reasoning, makes us sensible of imperfections and teaches us to correct them. Man first used the clumsy stone hammer, and its use taught him to transform it into more than a hundred types, differing in their raw material, their weight and their form.

Leucippus and his disciple Democritus, five centuries before the Christian Era, introduced the conception of the atom to explain the make-up of mind and matter, and during more than two thousand years, philosophers, the idea not occurring to them of resorting to experience that they might test the atomic hypothesis, indulged in discussions on the atom in itself, on the

fullness of matter indefinitely continued, on *emptiness*, discontinuity, etc. and it was not until the end of the 18th century that Dalton utilized the conception of Democritus to explain chemical combinations. The atom, with which the philosophers had been able to do nothing, became in the hands of the chemists "one of the most powerful tools of research that human reason has succeeded in creating." But now, after its use, this marvelous tool has been found imperfect and the radio-activity of matter obliges the physicists to pulverize the atom, that ultimate particle of matter, indivisible and impenetrable, into ultra-ultra particles, of the same nature in all atoms, and carriers of electricity. The atomicules, a thousand times smaller than the atom of hydrogen, the smallest of atoms, are said to whirl with an extraordinary velocity around a central nucleus, as the planets and earth revolve around the sun. The atom might be a miniature solar system and the elements of the bodies which we know might differ in themselves only in number and the gyratory movements of their atomicules. The recent discoveries of radio-activity, which shake the fundamental laws of mathematical physics, ruin the atomic base of the chemical structure. It is impossible to mention a more noteworthy example of the sterility of verbal discussions and the fertility of experience. Action alone in the material and intellectual world is fruitful: "In the beginning was action".

Economic determinism is a new tool put by Marx at the disposal of socialists to establish a little order in the disorder of historic facts, which the historians and philosophers have been incapable of classifying and explaining. Their class prejudices and their narrowness of mind give to the socialists the monopoly of this tool; but the latter before using it wish to convince themselves that it is absolutely perfect and that it may become the key to all the problems of history; on this account, it is quite possible for them to continue during their whole lives to discourse and to write articles and volumes on historical materialism, without adding a single idea to the subject. Men of science are less timorous; they think that "from the practical point of view it is of secondary importance that theories and hypotheses be correct provided that they guide us to results in agreement with the facts"*. Truth, after all, is merely the best-working hypothesis; often error is the shortest road to a discovery. Christopher Columbus, starting from the error in figuring made by Ptolemy, on the circumference of the earth, discovered America, when he thought he was arriving at the East Indies. Darwin recognizes that the first idea of his theory of natural selection was suggested to him by the false law of Malthus on population, which he

* W. Rucker: Inaugural address at the Scientific Congress of Glasgow

accepted with closed eyes. Physicists can to-day perceive that the hypothesis of Democritus is insufficient to include the phenomena recently studied, yet that does not alter the fact that it served to build up modern chemistry.

It is in fact little observed that Marx has not presented his method of historical interpretation as a body of doctrine with axioms, theorems, corollaries and lemmas; it is for him merely an instrument of research; he formulates it in a workmanlike style and puts it to the test. It can thus be criticized only by contesting the results which it gives in his hands, for example by refuting his theory of the class struggle. This our historians and philosophers carefully refrain from doing. They regard it as the impure work of the demon, precisely because it has led Marx to the discovery of this powerful motive force in history.

II.

DEISTIC AND IDEALIST PHILOSOPHIES OF HISTORY.

History is such a chaos of facts beyond man's control, progressing and receding, clashing and interclashing, appearing and disappearing without apparent reason, that we are tempted to think it impossible to bind them and classify them into series from which can be discovered the causes of evolution and revolution.

The collapse of systems in history has given rise in the minds of thinking men like Helmholtz to the doubt whether it is possible to formulate a historical law that reality would confirm. This doubt has become so general that the intellectuals no longer venture to construct like the philosophers of the first half of the 19th century, plans of universal history; it is indeed an echo of the incredulity of the economists as to the possibility of controlling economic forces. But need we conclude from the difficulties of the historic problem and the ill success of attempts to solve it that its solution is beyond the reach of the human mind? In that case social phenomena would stand apart as the only ones which could not be logically linked to determining causes.

Common sense has never admitted such an impossibility; on the contrary, men have always believed that what came to them, fortunate or unfortunate, was part of a plan preconceived by a superior being. *Man proposes and God disposes* is a historical axiom of popular wisdom which carries as much truth as the axioms of geometry, on condition, however, that we interpret the meaning of the word God.

All peoples have thought that a god directed their history. The cities of antiquity each possessed a state divinity or *poliad* as the Greeks called it, watching over their destinies and dwelling

in the temple consecrated to him. The Jehovah of the Old Testament was a divinity of this kind; he was lodged in a wooden box, called "Ark of the Covenant", which was transported when the tribes of Israel changed their location, and which was placed at the front of the armies in order that he might fight for his people. He took his quarrels so much to heart, according to the Bible, that he exterminated his enemies,—men, women, children and beasts. The Romans, during the Second Punic War, thought it useful as a means of resistance to Hannibal to couple up their state divinity with that of Pessinus, namely, Cybele, the mother of the gods; they brought over from Asia Minor her statue, a big shapeless stone, and introduced into Rome her orgiastic worship: as they were at once superstitious and astute politicians, they annexed the state divinity of each conquered city, sending its statue to the capitol; they reasoned that, no longer dwelling among the conquered people, it would cease to protect them.

The Christians had no other idea of divinity when, to drive out the Pagan gods, they broke their statues and burned their temples, and when they called on Jesus and His eternal Father to battle with the demons who stirred up the heresies of Allah which opposed the crescent to the cross.* The cities of the Middle Ages put themselves under the protection of municipal divinities; St. Genevieve was that of Paris. The Republic of Venice, that it might have an abundance of these protecting divinities, brought over from Alexandria the skeleton of St. Mark and stole at Montpellier that of St. Roques. Civilized nations have never denied the Pagan belief; each monopolizes for its use the only and universal God of the Christians, and makes therefrom its state divinity. Thus there are as many only and universal Gods as there are Christian nations, and the former fight among themselves as soon as the latter declare war: each nation prays its only and universal God to exterminate its rival and sings Te Deums in His honor if it is victorious, convinced that it owes its triumph only to His all-powerful intervention. The belief in the intrusion of God into human quarrels is not simulated by statesmen to please the coarse superstition of ignorant crowds; they share it. The private letters recently published, which Bismarck wrote to his wife during the war of 1870-71, show him believing that God passed His time in occupying Himself with him, his son and the Prussian armies.

The philosophers who have taken God for the directing guide of history share this infatuation; they imagine that this

*) The first Christians believed as firmly in the Pagan gods and in their miracles as in Jesus and his prodigies. Tertullian, in his "Apologetica", and St. Augustine, in his "City of God", report as undeniable facts that Esculapius had raised certain dead persons whose names they give, and that a Vestal had carried water from the Tiber in a sieve, that another had towed a ship with her girdle, etc.

God, creator of the universe and humanity, can be interested in nothing else than their country, religion and politics. Bossuet's "Discourse on Universal History" is one of the most successful specimens of the kind: the Pagan nations exterminate each other to prepare for the coming of Christianity, his religion, and the Christian nations slaughter each other to assure the greatness of France, his country, and the glory of Louis XIV, his master. The historic movement, guided by God, culminated in the Sun-King; when he was extinguished, shadows invaded the world, and the Revolution, which Joseph de Maistre calls "the work of Satan," burst forth.

Satan triumphed over God, the state divinity of the aristocracy and the Bourbons. The bourgeoisie, the class which God held in small regard, possessed itself of power and guillotined the king He had anointed: natural sciences, which He had cursed, triumphed and engendered for the bourgeoisie more riches than He had been able to give to His favorites, the nobles and the legitimate kings; Reason, which He had bound, broke her chains and dragged Him before her tribunal. The reign of Satan began. The romantic poets of the first half of the nineteenth century composed hymns in his honor; he was the unconquerable vanquished, the great martyr, the consoler and hope of the oppressed; he symbolized the bourgeoisie in perpetual revolt against nobles, priests and tyrants. But the victorious bourgeoisie had not the courage to take him for its state divinity; it patched up God, whom Reason had slightly disfigured, and restored Him to honor; nevertheless, not having entire faith in His omnipotence, it added to him a troop of demigods: Progress, Justice, Liberty, Civilization, Humanity, Fatherland, etc., who were chosen to preside over the destinies of the nations who had shaken off the yoke of the aristocracy. These new gods are Ideas, "Spiritual Forces," "imponderable Forces." Hegel undertook to bring back this polytheism of Ideas into the monotheism of the Idea, which, born of itself, creates the world and history by its own unfolding. The God of historic philosophy is a mechanic who for His amusement constructs the universe, whose movements He regulates, and manufactures man, whose destinies He directs after a plan known to Himself alone, but the philosophic historians have not perceived that this eternal God is not the creator but the creature of man, who, in proportion to his own development, remodels Him, and that, far from being the director, He is the plaything of historic events.

The philosophy of the idealists, in appearance less childish than that of the deists, is an unfortunate application to history of the deductive method of the abstract sciences, whose propositions, logically linked, flow from certain undemonstrable axioms which

impose themselves by the principle of evidence. The mathematicians are wrong in not troubling themselves regarding the fashion in which the ideas slipped into the human mind.* The idealists disdain to inquire into the origin of their Ideas, coming no one knows whence; they confine themselves to affirming that they exist of themselves, that they are perfectible, and that in proportion as they become perfect they modify men and social phenomena, placed under their control; thus it is only necessary to know the evolution of Ideas to acquire the laws of history; in this way Pythagoras thought that the knowledge of the properties of numbers would give knowledge of the properties of bodies.

But because the axioms of mathematics cannot be demonstrated by reasoning, that does not prove that they are not properties of bodies, just like color, form, weight and warmth, which experience alone reveals, and the idea of which exists in the brain only because man has come in contact with the bodies of nature. It is, in fact, as impossible to prove by reasoning that a body is square, colored, heavy or warm as to demonstrate that the part is smaller than the whole, that two and two make four, etc.; all we can do is to state the experimental fact and draw its logical conclusions.†

The Ideas of Progress, Justice, Liberty, Fatherland, etc.,

*) It is probable that in the intellectual baggage inherited from animals man found certain mathematical axioms which they put in practice. For example, the pigeons do not begin to sit until the female has laid two eggs, as if they knew that one and one make two; dogs, birds of prey, in fact all animals, to go to the object which they desire, follow a straight line, as if they knew that it is the shortest road from one point to another.

+) Leibnitz vainly sought to demonstrate that two and two make four; his demonstration, in the language of mathematicians, is merely a verification. Rather than admit that the axioms of geometry are experimental facts, as Freycinet proves in his remarkable study, "Dé L'expérience en Géométrie". Kant maintains that they have been discovered by a happy combination of intuition and reflection, and Poincaré, who in this case expresses the opinion of a great number of mathematicians, declares in his "Scénè et L'hypothèse", that axioms are "conventions... Our choice among all possible conventions is guided by experimental facts, but it remains free and is merely limited by the necessity of avoiding any contradiction" in the propositions deduced from the convention with which we have started out. He thinks, as does Kant, that these propositions do not require to be confirmed by experience. Thus, then, freedom remains for the Christian mathematician, taking seriously the mystery of the Trinity, to agree that one and one and one make one, to deduce an arithmetic which might be as logical as the non-Euclid geometries of Labatschewski and of Riemann, who hold, the former that from one point an infinity of parallels to a straight line may be drawn, and the latter that not even one can be drawn.

The non-Euclid geometries, all of whose propositions are deduced from each other and linked rigorously, and which oppose their theorems to the theorems of Euclid's geometry, the truth of which has been proclaimed as absolute for two thousand years, are admirable manifestations of the logic of the human brain. But by the same token, capitalist society, which is a living reality, and not a simple ideological construction, may be given as a proof of this logical power. The division of its members into hostile classes; the pitiless exploitation of the wage workers, impoverishing themselves in proportion as they heap up wealth; the crises of overproduction producing famine in the midst of abundance; the idle, adulated and gorged with pleasures; and the producers, despised and loaded with miseries; ethics, religion, philosophy

like the axioms of mathematics, do not exist of themselves and outside the experimental domain; they do not precede experience but follow it; they do not engender the events of history, but they are the consequence of the social phenomena which in evolving create them, transform them and suppress them; they do not become active forces save as they emanate directly from the social streams. One of the tasks of history unnoticed by the philosophers is the discovery of the social causes, of which they themselves are the product, and which give them their power of acting upon the brains of the men of a given epoch.

Bossuet and the deist philosophers, who promoted God to the dignity of a conscious director of the historic movement, have after all merely conformed to the popular opinion of the historic role played by the divinity: the idealists who substitute for Him the Idea-Forces merely utilize in historic fashion the vulgar bourgeois opinion. Every bourgeois proclaims that his private and public acts are inspired by Progress, Justice, Patriotism, Humanity, etc. To be convinced of this we need only go through the advertisements of the manufacturers and merchants, the prospectuses of financiers and the electoral programs of politicians.

The ideas of Progress and of evolution are modern in their origin, they are a transposition into history of that *human perfectibility* which became fashionable with the eighteenth century. It was inevitable that the bourgeoisie should regard its entrance into power as an immense step of social progress, while the aristocracy looked upon it as a disastrous setback. The French Revolution, because it occurred more than a century after the English Revolution, and consequently in conditions more fully ripe, substituted so suddenly and completely the bourgeoisie for the nobility that from that time the idea of Progress took firm root in the public opinion of Europe. The European capitalists believed themselves founded on the power of Progress. They affirmed in good faith that their habits, manners, virtues, private and public morality, social and family organization, industry and commerce were an advance over everything which had existed. The past was only ignorance, barbarity, injustice and unreason:

and science consecrating the social disorder; universal suffrage giving political power to the bourgeois minority; everything, in short, in the material and ideological structure of our civilization, is a defiance launched at human reason, and nevertheless everything is linked together with faultless logic, and all the iniquities follow with a mathematical exactness from the right of property, which grants to the capitalist the privilege of stealing the surplus value created by the wage worker.

Logic is one of the essential properties of brain substance; from whatever reasoning, true or false, and from whatever facts, just or unjust, with which man starts out, he constructs an ideological or material edifice all of whose parts answer to each other. The social and intellectual history of humanity swarms with examples of this cast-iron logic, which unhappily, it has so often turned against itself.

"Finally, for the first time, cried Hegel, Reason was to govern the world." The bourgeois of 1793 deified her; already, in the beginning of the bourgeois period in the ancient world Plato (in the *Timaeus*) declared her superior to Necessity, and Socrates reproached Anaxagoras with having, in his cosmogony, explained everything by material causes without having made any use of Reason, from whom everything could be hoped (*Phaedo*). The social dominance of the bourgeoisie is the reign of Reason.

But a historical event, even so considerable a one as the grasping of power by the bourgeoisie, does not alone suffice to prove Progress. The deists had made of God the sole author of history; the idealists, not wishing it to be said that Progress in the past had deported itself as a do-nothing Idea, discovered that during the Middle Ages it had prepared for the triumph of the bourgeois class by organizing it, by giving it intellectual culture and by enriching it, while it wore out the offensive and defensive forces of the aristocratic class and demolished stone by stone the fortress of the Church. The idea of evolution was thus to introduce itself naturally in the train of the idea of Progress.

But for the bourgeoisie there is no progressive evolution save that which prepares for its own triumph, and as it is only for some ten centuries that its historians can find definite traces of its organic development, they lose their Ariadne's thread as soon as they venture into the labyrinth of earlier history, whose facts they are satisfied to narrate without attempting to marshall them into progressive series. Since the goal of progressive evolution is the establishment of the social dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, that end once attained Progress must then cease to progress. In fact, the bourgeois who proclaim that their capture of power is a social progress unique in history, declare that it would be a return to barbarism, "to slavery", as Herbert Spencer says, if they were dislodged from power by the proletariat. The vanquished aristocracy had looked upon its defeat in no other light. Belief in the decree of Progress, instinctive and unconscious in the bourgeois masses, shows itself conscious and reasoned in certain bourgeois thinkers. Hegel and Comte, to cite merely two of the most famous, affirm squarely that their philosophic system closes the series, that it is the crowning and the end of the progressive evolution of thought. So, then, philosophy and social and political institutions progress only to arrive at their bourgeois form, then Progress progresses no more.

The bourgeoisie and its more intelligent intellectuals, who fix insurmountable limits to their progressive Progress, do better still; they withdraw from its influence certain social organisms of prime importance. The economists, historians and moralists, to demonstrate in an irrefutable fashion that the paternal form

of the family and the individual form of property will not be transformed, assure us that they have existed from all time. They put forth these imprudent assertions at the moment when researches which have been carried on for half a century are bringing into clear light the primitive forms of the family and of property. These bourgeois scientists are ignorant of them, or reason as if they were ignorant of them.

The ideas of Progress and of evolution were especially fashionable during the first years of the nineteenth century, when the bourgeoisie was still intoxicated with its political victory, and with the prodigious development of its economic riches: the philosophers, historians, moralists, politicians, romancers and poets fitted their writings and their teachings to the sauce of progressive Progress, which Fourier was alone or almost alone in reviling. But toward the middle of the century they were obliged to calm their immoderate enthusiasm; the apparition of the proletariat on the political stage in England and in France awoke in the mind of the bourgeoisie certain disquieting reflections on the eternal duration of its social dominance. Progressive Progress lost its charms. The ideas of Progress and of evolution would finally have ceased to be current in bourgeois phraseology had not the men of science, who from the end of the eighteenth century had grasped the idea of evolution circulating in the social environment, utilized it to explain the formation of worlds and the organization of vegetables and animals. They gave it such a scientific value and such a popularity that it was impossible to sidetrack it.

But to show the progressive development of the bourgeoisie for a certain number of centuries back does not explain that historic movement any more than to trace the curve described in falling by a stone thrown into the air teaches us the causes of its fall. The philosophic historians attribute this evolution to the ceaseless action of the Spiritual Forces, particularly Justice, the strongest of all, which according to an idealistic and academic philosopher "is always present even though it arrives only by degrees into human thought and into social facts." Bourgeois society and its way of thinking are thus the last and highest manifestations of this immanent Justice, and it is to obtain these fine results that this lady has toiled in the mines of history.

Let us consult the judicial records of the lady aforesaid for information on her character and manners.

A ruling class always considers that what serves its economic and political interests is just and that what diserves them is unjust. The Justice which it conceives is realized when its class interests are satisfied. The interests of the bourgeoisie are thus the guides of bourgeois justice, as the interests of the aristocracy

were those of feudal justice. Thus, through unconscious irony, Justice is pictured blindfolded that she may not see the mean and sordid interests which she protects with her aegis.

The feudal and guild organization, injuring the interests of the bourgeoisie, was in its eyes so unjust that its immanent Justice resolved to destroy it. The bourgeois historians relate that it could not tolerate the forcible robberies of the feudal barons, who knew no other methods of rounding out their fields and filling their purses. All of which does not prevent their honest, immanent Justice from encouraging the forcible robberies which, without risking their skins, the pacific capitalists have committed by proletarians disguised as soldiers in the barbarous countries of the old and the new world. It is not that this sort of theft pleases the virtuous lady; she solemnly approves and authorizes, with all legal sanctions, only the economic theft which, without clamorous violence, the bourgeoisie daily commits on the wage worker. Economic theft is so perfectly suited to the temperament and character of Justice that she metamorphoses herself into a watch dog over bourgeois wealth because it is an accumulation of thefts as legal as they are just.

Justice, who, as the philosophers say, has done marvelously in the past, who reigns in bourgeois society and who leads men toward a future of peace and happiness, is on the contrary the fertile mother of social iniquities. It is Justice who gave the slaveholder the right to possess man like a chattel; it is she again who gives the capitalist the right to exploit the children, women and men of the proletariat worse than beasts of burden. It is Justice who permitted the slave holder to chastise the slave, who hardened his heart when he lacerated him with blows. It is she again who authorizes the capitalist to grasp the surplus value created by the wage worker and who puts his conscience at rest when he rewards with starvation wages the labor which enriches him. I stand on my right, said the slave holder when he lashed the slave; I stand on my right, says the capitalist when he steals from the wage worker the fruits of his labor.

The capitalist class, measuring everything by its own standards, decorates with the name of Civilization and Humanity its social order and its manner of treating human beings. It is only to export civilization to the barbarous nations, only to rescue them from their gross immorality, only to ameliorate their miserable conditions of existence that it undertakes its colonial expeditions, and its Civilization and its Humanity manifest themselves under the specific form of stupefaction through Christianity, poisoning with alcohol, pillage and extermination of the natives. But we should be doing an injustice if we thought that it favors the barbarians and that it does not diffuse the benefits of

its Humanity over the laboring classes of the nations which it rules. Its Civilization and its Humanity may there be counted up by the mass of men, women and children dispossessed of all property, condemned to compulsory labor day and night, to periodical vacations at their own expense, to alcoholism, consumption, rickets; by the increasing number of misdemeanors and crimes, by the multiplication of insane asylums and by the development and improvement of the penitentiary system.

Never has ruling class so loudly clamored for the Ideal, because never had a ruling class had such need for obscuring its actions with idealistic chatter. This ideological charlatanism is its surest and most efficacious method for political and economic trickery. The startling contradiction between its words and its acts has not prevented the historians and philosophers from taking the eternal Ideas and Principles for the sole motive forces of the history of the capitalized nations. Their monumental error, which passes all bounds even for the intellectuals, is an incontestable proof of the power wielded by Ideas and of the adroitness with which the bourgeoisie has succeeded in cultivating and exploiting this force so as to derive an income from it. The financiers pad their prospectuses with patriotic principles, with ideas of civilization, humanitarian sentiments and six-per-cent investments for fathers of families. These are infallible baits when fishing for suckers. De Lesseps could never have inflated his magnificent bubble at Panama, raking in the savings of eight hundred thousand little people, had not that "great Frenchman" promised to add another glory to the halo of his Fatherland, to broaden civilized humanity and to enrich the subscribers.

Eternal Ideas and Principles are such irresistible attractions that there is no financial, industrial or commercial prospectus, nor even an advertisement of alcoholic drink or patent medicine, but is spiced with it; political treasons and economic frauds hoist the standard of Ideas and Principles*.

*) Vandervelde and other comrades are scandalized at my irreverent and outlandish fashion of stripping off the covering from the eternal Ideas and Principles. To make metaphysical dummies out of Justice, Liberty and Fatherland, which hold the center of the stage in academic and parliamentary discourses, electoral programs and mercantile advertisements, what a profanation! If these comrades had lived in the time of the Encyclopedists they would have thundered their wrath against Diderot and Voltaire, who laid violent hands on the collar of aristocratic ideology and dragged it before the bar of their Reason, who ridiculed the sacred Truths of Christianity, the Maid of Orleans, blue Blood and the Honor of the Nobility, Authority, Divine Right and other immortal things. They would have sentenced "Don Quixote" to burning because that incomparable masterpiece of romantic literature ridiculed pitilessly the chivalrous virtues exalted by the poems and romances which were read by the aristocracy.

Belfort Bax reproaches me for the contempt in which I hold Justice, Liberty and the other entities of the metaphysics of the propertied class, which he says are concepts so universal and so necessary that in order to criticize their bourgeois caricatures I avail myself of a certain ideal of Justice and Liberty. But indeed I am not, any more than the most spiritualistic philosophers, able to escape from my social environ-

The historic philosophy of the idealists could not be other than a war of words, equally insipid and indigestible, since they have not perceived that the capitalist parades the eternal principles for no other purpose than to mask the egoistic motives of his actions, and since they have not arrived at the point of recognizing the humbug of the bourgeois ideology. But the lamentable abortions of the idealist philosophy do not prove that it is impossible to arrive at the determining causes of the organization and evolution of human societies as the chemists have succeeded in doing with those which regulate the agglomeration of molecules into complex bodies.

"The social world", says Vico, the father of the philosophy of history, "is undeniably the work of man, whence it results that we may and must find its principles nowhere else than in the modifications of human intelligence. Is it not surprising to every thinking man that the philosophers have seriously undertaken to know the world of nature, which God made and the knowledge of which He has reserved for Himself, and that they have neglected to meditate over that social world, the knowledge of which men may have, since men have made it?"*

The numerous failures of the deistic and idealistic methods compel the trial of a new method of interpreting history.

ment. We are obliged to submit to its current ideas, and each one cuts them to his measure and takes his individual concepts for criteria of the ideas and the actions of others. But if these ideas are necessary in the social environment where they are produced it does not follow that, like the axioms of mathematics, they are necessary in all social environments, as Socrates supposed, who, in the *Protagoras*, I believe, demonstrated the eternal necessity of Justice by saying that even brigands regulated according to it their conduct among themselves. Precisely so, because the societies based on private property, whether family or individual, are societies of brigands, whose ruling classes pillage the other nations and steal the fruits of the labor of the subject classes, — slaves, serfs or wage workers, — this is why Justice and Liberty are for them eternal principles. The philosophers declare them to be universal and necessary concepts because they know only societies founded on private property and they cannot conceive of a society resting on other foundations.

But the socialist who knows that capitalist production is carrying us on inevitably to a society based on common property, does not doubt that these universal and necessary concepts will vanish from the human head with the mine and thine, and the exploitation of man characteristic of the societies based on private property which have given birth to them. This belief is not suggested by sentimental reveries, but by observed facts beyond the reach of discussion. It is proved that the communist savages and barbarians of the prehistoric period have no notion of these eternal principles. Mayne, who, by the way, is a scientific legislist, has not found them in the village communities of contemporary India, whose inhabitants take tradition and custom for their rules of conduct. Since the universal and necessary concepts utilized by the men of societies based on private property to organize their civil and political life will no longer be necessary to regulate the relations of men of the future society based on common property, history will gather them up and classify them for the museum of dead ideas.

* Giambista Vico: *Principi di Scienza nuova*.

PAUL LAFARGUE.

(Translated by Charles H. Kerr.)
(To be Continued.)

EDITORIAL

Some Problems of the Trust.

One of the favorite illustrations to show the scientific character of Socialist philosophy is its power to predict social phenomena, and the star illustration of this power is that the trust was predicted by socialist writers nearly a half century before it came.

The chapter which is most frequently quoted in behalf of this position is the famous one on "The Historical Character of Capitalist Accumulation", from the first volume of "Capital". To be sure this was published only some thirty years ago, but its substance had appeared in previous writings by the same author at a sufficiently early date to justify the claim to long prophetic insight which is made for him.

This chapter is itself affords an example of the most condensed reasoning combined with brilliant intense expression of that reasoning to be found in any language. It is not surprising that around it has waged the most bitter of Socialist controversies. Its statements formed the point against which Bernsteinists and Revisionists hurled their attacks. It is safe to say that fifty percent of the Socialist literature of today is based upon the positions set forth in this chapter, and if there be any reader who does not recall it now is the place for him to stop and read it. If he reads it as he would a popular novel it will not take more than ten minutes, for it would make less than four such pages as the one before you at the present moment. But if it is thoroughly assimilated the reader will take hours and days.

There are certain sentences in it that are so striking, and so applicable to the matter under discussion that they will bear repeating: As soon as the process of transformation has sufficiently decomposed the old society", says Marx, "as soon as the capitalist mode of production stands on its own feet, then ** the further expropriation of private proprietors takes a new form. That which is now to be expropriated is no longer the laborer working for himself, but the capitalist exploiting many laborers. This expropriating is so accomplished by the action of the immanent laws of capitalist production it-

self, by the centralization of capital. One capitalist always kills many. * * * Centralization of the means of production and socialization of labor at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated."

Here we have the prophecy not only of the trust, but of its disappearance. On the truth of this prophecy, and of the laws which lie back of that prophecy is based much of socialist reasoning. Some of this reasoning has been evolved from other and less careful examinations of industrial evolution than those upon which Marx based his statements. Indeed the more carefully Marx is studied the more the student is struck with the cautious accuracy of his statements even at times when he uses then most vehement expressions.

From this chapter of Marx' and similar expressions has been drawn the material from which to construct a theory that the coming of the trust meant the immediate downfall of capitalism, — that it was the appearance of the trust that was in itself to "burst the integument of capitalism". To be sure there is nothing in Marx that justifies this position. Yet this has been interwoven with the Marxian theory of crises to form the foundation of a theory that the coming of the trust heralded the coming of a world-wide industrial crisis in the midst of which the transition would be made to socialism.

Let us examine some of the phenomena introduced by the trust and see in how far these things that have been so widely accepted as fundamental principles of Marxian Socialism are justifiable.

There is much reason to believe that Marx looked upon the trust stage as an exceedingly temporary one. Although, with that characteristic scientific caution to which reference was just made, he never made any definite statement to that effect, it would seem that he considered the trust stage the climax, the closing scene of capitalism, and that, in his mind, the stage would be occupied but a short time with the gigantic actors of the era of monopoly. Otherwise, socialism, to him would have been little else than a theoretical system, with little need of practical political parties.

Today we are in the midst of that trust era. We should be surrounded by the fragments of the "bursting integument of capitalism." To a certain extent this condition does prevail, but on the whole the integument is fairly firm.

It would seem that what Marx did not see, or at least did not attempt to analyze, is the economic workings of a society in which competition should not be the dominant factor. Today it is nonsense to talk about the price of coal, kerozene, railroad rates, telegraph tolls, and a host of other things being fixed by competition, or even being determined by the amount of labor power which they contain. If this be treason, make the most of it. It is a fact that should be faced at least. To be sure Marx saw much more of this fact than

most of his followers, as may be shown to those who should chance to fall afoul of the above statement.

It would have required more than human foresight for anyone to have analyzed the economic interactions of a society which did not yet exist. For Marx to have attempted it would have been as foolish as for us at the present time to attempt to foretell the details of a co-operative commonwealth, and would have placed him among the utopians whom he so frequently denounced.

It is now evident that the trust ruled society will be with us for some few years at least. We are now within that society. Our practical tactics and our theoretical writings must be adapted to that society, and not to the competitive one that has been left behind. Yet there is almost nothing in Socialist writings to show even a recognition of this fact.

It would be manifestly impossible in the scope of an editorial to do more than suggest a few of the problems and leave them without discussion to be considered by the readers.

The coming of the trust has once more transformed production for the market back to production for use. But the circle, like all those representing social progress, is a spiral, and the present position bears little resemblance to the one which was left behind at the beginning of the last century. It is well-known among business men that the great trusts of today, especially those in steel, the manufacture of electrical supplies, copper, railroad supplies, locomotives, etc. do not produce for an unknown market, but only "on order". To a large extent this removes one of the greatest elements of the industrial chaos so characteristic of the competitive age. There will not be any great "overproduction" in any of these lines. New mills are not built when the demand shows a sudden increase. On the contrary the customer is permitted to wait the gracious pleasure of the producer, until the accumulated orders become so great as to certainly justify the addition of new productive facilities.

Another fact, closely related to the above, but more frequently noted, is that the trust, occupying the field, can control production, curtail or increase it to meet fluctuations, without overstocking the market.

The relation of the trust to labor raises another interesting question. The ordinary trade union depends for success in strike largely upon the fear of the employer that some competitor will get his trade while his industry is tied up with a strike. Under a trust organization of industry there are no competitors, and the only thing which is endangered is immediate profits, and these can be postponed with joy for the certainty of the greater profits that will follow the crushing of rebellious laborers. On the other hand, if the revolt of labor seems to really threaten all profits, the trust can increase the share of labor, without fear of being underbidden in the market by more successful exploiters.

There is no doubt but what there is enough competition to render all the calculations of the trusts most uncertain. It is also possible that this residuum of competition is sufficient to cause individual crises in the future but it is quite certain that these crises will be somewhat different from those which have gone before and it is worth while for us to begin to consider what new features are being brought into the problem.

Another feature closely allied with these we have been describing is that for the first time the capitalist class is beginning to be class-conscious, in the wider, far seeing meaning in which socialists use the word. There can be no doubt but what some of the rulers of the present society realize the existence of the problem of disposing of the vast amounts of surplus values taken from the workers. If they do realize this and can secure unity of action through governmental and private agencies, the questions of overproduction, crises, and relation to labor must be greatly affected. There are plenty of opportunities for the capitalist class to use any surplus at its disposal. The Panama and Erie canals, the irrigation project of the government, are but a few of the ways in which large sums of money can be expended in works that are not immediately productive of any surplus value in a form that will be troublesome to its possessors.

Any one who has seen European water-ways with their continuous banks of masonry can see that if a similar plan of improvement should be undertaken for the Mississippi and its tributaries, it would afford an outlet for billions of dollars and might easily defer any over-production crises for a generation.

These are but the most general suggestions of some directions in which the Socialist explanation of economic phenomena and evolution is being modified by recent developments, which are in themselves in direct accord with socialist philosophy.

There is need that these should be analyzed and explained that it may be seen whether these industrial changes produce any essential change in the superstructure of political tactics that has been built upon them.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

That slavery in some form is the ultimate lot of the working people of this country has long been predicted by those who have watched the evolution of capitalism. Every day almost some new evidence is given that this probable fate of labor is not mere speculation or the thoughtless assertion of some crank, but the facts speak loud enough. We all know how in industrial struggles strike-breakers are loaned about among employers like so many cattle?

For example, recently a convention was held in Cleveland by the so-called Master Sheet Metal Workers' Association (affiliated with the American Federation of Capitalism). A Cincinnati "master" reported that there was a strike on in his place and requested assistance. The other "masters" in the convention promised to send him all the "men" he needed to pick his cotton—or rather do his sheet metal work. Such is the situation in all lines of industry.

Now, as economic power has its political reflex, as the Socialists say, we find that this principle of ownership of men by men is given expression by the courts. Not long ago a manufacturing concern in Michigan secured an injunction against a competitor restraining the latter from enticing its employes away by offering better working conditions!

But right here before me is the Wall Street Journal of Sept. 19. On the front page is a long article captioned "Property Rights in Labor." The Journal quotes liberally from a decision just handed down by Judge Jones, of the Circuit Court of the United States, in the case of the Louisville & Nashville railroad against the Alabama Railroad Commission to restrain the latter body from interfering with its employes. Judge Jones declares, among other things:

"An employer has a property right in the services of his workmen in his business. The employer can maintain an action against any one who entices his servant to leave him, or prevents the servant from working for his employer. This property is protected by the sanction of our criminal laws also."

Halt, you runaway nigger! Is this plain enough for you? The Wall Street Journal in its comments, adds that this principle may be applied in the relations of employers and trade unions, and wonders at the "master" "that larger use has not been made of this property right in disputes with organized labor when there is clear evidence of employes being enticed away from his employment."

The foregoing is something for you to think about, Mr. Workingman. If it's not clear enough probably the "masters" will furnish you with a diagram of what they intend doing.

It is not unlikely that the American Federation of Labor executive council will retaliate against the Van Cleave-Parry-Post outfit, who have brought suit in the Washington courts to have union labor's "unfair list" declared illegal. Not only is the attack of the enemies of organized labor to be met and fought through to the United States Supreme Court, but counter action may be instituted charging the employers with conspiracy. It is claimed that plenty of evidence can be produced to prove that the Van Cleave bosses have blacklisted organized workingmen and thus boycotted trade unions, and that even the formation of the capitalistic federation of some twenty odd national employers' associations was a secret conspiracy. President Van Cleave, of the National Association of Manufacturers, the head and front of the movement to disrupt organized labor, is making a ridiculous attempt to thinly veneer the real purpose of the labor-crushers. Their sole object, they say, is to enforce "industrial peace" and to protect the dear public, whose guardians they have appointed themselves. For that purpose they are raising a war fund of \$1,500,000, establishing labor bureaus to furnish strikebreakers in times of trouble, and preparing lists of all union men and especially known agitators. It is further asserted that at their New York convention these capitalistic guardian angels agreed to quietly lay off their union employes wherever possible, beginning with the most "rabid agitators," and that the output of their plants is to be reduced rather than employ known members of organized labor. It is claimed that this campaign is now on in Eastern and Middle Western States.

The organizations that are affiliated with this American Federation of Capitalism (which should be its proper name) are: The Citizens' Industrial Association of America, National Association of Agricultural Implement and Vehicle Manufacturers, National Foundry Association, National Association of Employing Lithographers, Merchant Tailors' National Protective Association, National Wagon Manufacturers' Association, National Plow Association, National Erectors' Association, National Association of Master Plumbers, National Metal Trades Association, American Anti-Boycott Association, American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, United Typothetae of America, National Association of Master Metal Workers, Hardware Manufacturers' Association of the United States, Master Copper Workers of the United States, National Association of Cotton Manufacturers, and Carriage Builders' National Association.

While the telegraphers' strike has held the attention of the organized workers of the continent during the past months, the struggles of the bookbinders for an eight-hour day, of the ore miners of Minnesota for recognition and an advance in wages, of the machinists on the Erie railway and in half a dozen cities for better conditions, of the building trades in Washington and a number of smaller places against the open shop and numerous other local contests, such as the street railway men and others in San Francisco, brewers in New Orleans, etc., have all added to the intensity of the class war that is raging between the organized workers on the one hand and organized capital on the other.

The telegraphers made a magnificent contest from the start for a comparatively new organization without funds and lacking the experience and discipline that come only with years of hard knocks. This is especially true when it is considered that the telegraphers were confronted by three as rapacious corporations that ever existed

on this earth. The Western Union management looks upon the operators as being mere slaves who deserve no consideration whatever. The wages paid and hours worked by the telegraphers are nothing short of scandalous. The Postal Co. is a despicable ingrate. It came into the field as a competitor of the W. U. and was largely built up on its representations as a friend of labor and an enemy of the old corporation. The Associated Press, perhaps the most dangerous bunch of this hydra-headed monopoly, is too well known as an agency that deliberately garbles or suppresses news to require any description. In most national contests a good percentage of the union membership is employed by fair concerns, and thus are enabled to assist their fellow-workers on strike by paying liberal dues and assessments. But with the telegraphers only an insignificant fraction of the membership was employed on private wires and the strikers were forced to depend upon other trades and sympathizers from the beginning of the fight. This deplorable situation once more demonstrates the necessity of the American Federation of Labor accumulating a defense fund or inaugurating a plan to levy assessments indefinitely if required.

Anticipating the general strike of the bookbinders on Oct. 1, for an eight-hour work-day, employers in a number of cities locked out the unionists, secured injunctions and pursued the usual methods to discourage and weaken the organization, just as was done with the printers two years ago. The pressmen, who are closely allied to the bookbinders made their demands, through their international officers, for the eight-hour and the closed shop at the recent convention of the organized employers, known as the United Typothetae of America, at Niagara Falls. The journeymen were coldly turned down, the employers refusing to treat with them, and it is quite probable that the pressmen will now make common cause with the bookbinders. The Typographical Union, also allied with the binders and pressmen, hit the United Typothetae a blow from which the latter body will hardly recover. In a two-years' fight, during which the T. U. spent over \$3,500,000, the union enforced the eight-hour day practically all over the continent and nearly disrupted the United Typothetae. The binders and pressmen ought to be able to put the finishing touches to the Typothetae—unless the American Federation of Capitalism can inject new life into one of its constituent parts by tapping its \$1,500,000.

A feature of the machinists' strike on the Erie railway is the charge of the corporation management that they had paid \$10,000 a year to a "representative" of the union (or a total of \$22,000) to be immune from strikes. The capitalistic press quickly spread the news broadcast that the union had levied the blackmail. The fact is that neither the international or any local union received a penny of the money. It went into the capacious pockets of one George Warner, formerly a New York business agent, who was secretly employed by the Erie railway as a "labor commissioner," just as the Fuller Construction Co. once employed Sam Parks and as the Roebling Co. to-day has a number of skates on its pay roll. Warner, on his part, claimed that he had been paid the money to work against the passage of the Erie canal bill by the New York Legislature, that he had "double-crossed" the corporation by using the funds to boom the canal project, and that the whole scandal was raked up by the Socialists to destroy his usefulness because he had "consistently fought the reds" for a dozen years. Howsoever that may be, the fact is that the machinists' convention in St. Louis the past month did not like Warner's style of pitching and he was ousted as a delegate,

whereupon he began to yell louder than ever that the Socialists were after his scalp. This is a favorite trick of all crooks when their perfidy is discovered. They believe that when they whine for sympathy and holler "stop thief" at the Socialists attention is diverted from their villainous conduct. But that scheme is played out, although the Socialists may welcome the enmity of such people. The scheme is ausgespielt for the reason that the Socialists and their sympathizers are becoming altogether too numerous, and the body of workers has confidence in them whether or not they agree with or understand Socialist principles.

The struggle on the Minnesota ore range threatens to become as extended as the contest in Colorado. The Western Federation of Miners recently organized the iron ore diggers, and the United States Steel Corporation, which controls the range almost wholly, was determined to crush the movement. The miners, feeling the increased cost of necessities most severely, demanded a small increase in wages—the total amount any day would hardly equal the value of a dog collar for Mabel Gilman's husband. The men struck and soon the brutal methods of the Colorado labor-crushers were introduced. After taking his \$4,000,000 bride to their Parisian home, President W. E. Corey, of the U. S. Steel Corporation, returned and issued orders. Miners were evicted and credit refused them. The Western Federation established a commissary department and then the meat trust was influenced to withhold provisions. The farmers agreed to help the miners, and now it is reported that the trust intends to establish stores throughout the range and sell foodstuffs at cost in order to kill off the miners' co-operative stores and at the same time encourage the men to return to work and accept the lower cost of necessities in lieu of a raise in wages. This latest move if it is carried out, will be a terrible blow to the small-fry capitalists who have done the corporation's bidding throughout the struggle. They will be ruined and nobody will shed any tears at their unenviable plight. A press censorship also exists and it is almost impossible to obtain any news of what is occurring on the range.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

ENGLAND.

The fortieth annual Congress of British trade unions has just finished its session in London. This congress was contrasted in the opening speech with the one held forty years ago where there were only 34 delegates representing one hundred eighteen thousand members while at the present congress the delegates represented more than a million and a half.

The sharpest debate took place over the question of the labor members in Parliament. The first movement in the matter was taken by those who belong in the Liberal party, called "Lib-Labs," who brought forth a resolution that none but genuine labor union members shall receive the support of a union. They hoped by doing this to exclude some of the socialists.

The labor representative committee responded by offering to co-operate with the "Lib-Labs" on condition that they agree not to contest a seat where the labor party had a candidate in the field. There upon Gould from Hull declared that the time had come for the congress to get into closer touch with the Socialists and to chase the hyenas from the Liberal Party. He was here interrupted by the president who objected to his language. He continued that he could find no other expression for men who call themselves labor leaders and who then ran against such men as Hyndman and Grayson.

Other speakers joined in this denunciation of the "Lib-Labs" and the congress finally declared in favor of some sort of arrangement between the labor party and the Liberal labor representative.

There is little hope of such an understanding being reached, however, but if present conditions continue there will be no need for it as the number of labor members are decreasing as they are being replaced by new members of the labor party. One of the resolutions entered was for the abolition of the House of Lords and denouncing the government for its action in the Belfast riots and a resolution indorsing the New Zealand system of compulsory arbitration was defeated by one million and three thousand votes to three hundred three thousand votes. Finally a resolution was adopted ordering the secretary of the congress to become a member of the labor party. This means that from now on the person occupying this place must have the double qualification of a trade unionist and a member of a working class political organization.

FINLAND.

The new parliament of Finland meets on the second of September and will present a remarkable contrast to the previous one. Finland

is still subject to the Russian autocracy. The socialists are bringing in an extensive relief program. They are demanding that the vacant land shall be taken by the state and put in the control of the landless agricultural workers whose numbers are between eight and nine hundred thousand. They also demand the abolition of the old laws which greatly restrict the movements of the working class.

A somewhat peculiar feature of the Finnish situation is the strong Prohibition sentiment. Nearly all the parties are agreed on Prohibition. 170 out of 200 members of the Reichstag are pledged to prohibition. The Senate and the St. Petersburg government are in opposition of this since the income from alcohol is one of the great sources of revenue.

Another demand is that the standing army in Finland shall be made up of Finns with officers of the same nationality. It is also demanded that the age for voting shall be reduced from twenty-four to twenty-one years. Complete freedom of speech, press and organization is also demanded.

NORWAY.

The congress of the Scandinavian Socialists met at Christiania during the past month. There were 167 Norwegian delegates, 127 from Sweden, and 86 from Denmark. Finland was represented for the first time with 6 delegates. These represented the Socialist Parties of the various countries with a paid up membership of 120,000 in Sweden, 20,000 in Norway, 65,000 in Denmark, and 11,000 in Finland. In addition there were representatives of the trades unions, including 160,000 Swedish members, 100,000 Danes, and 40,000 Norwegians. Besides these regular participating delegates, there were also representatives from the central unions of Germany, Belgium and Hungary. H. Branting, the Socialist delegate from Stockholm, reviewed the progress of the Scandinavian Socialist Movement. Twenty years ago the first effort was made at Gothenburg to hold a meeting of all the Scandinavian countries. At that time, Denmark alone had an organization. Today more than 400,000 workingmen are organized in these three countries, and corresponding progress has been made in all other fields of working class effort. During the past year great progress has been made in the co-operative movement which is an integral part of the Socialist movement in most of the Scandinavian countries.

HUNGARY.

A great general strike took place on October 10. This strike was for the purpose of obtaining universal suffrage. The demonstration obtained immense proportions and has drawn within its ranks hundreds of thousands of workers whom even the trades union never touched. The demand is for universal, secret, adult, suffrage, regardless of sex. At present, Hungary is governed by what is known as the four class system of voting. According to this plan, the population is divided into four classes, each of which elects the same number of representatives regardless of the number of votes that may be cast. The first class is composed of the landed nobility; the second includes the great capitalists who pay over two hundred and fifty dollars per year for direct taxes; the third class embraces the small capitalists, merchants, farmers, and others who pay a tax of between one hundred and fifty and two hundred and fifty dollars;

the fourth class embraces the semi-feudal holders of small plots of land, who pay their taxes in all kinds of ways. The industrial laborer has no vote whatever.

GERMANY.

Coming as it did immediately after Stuttgart, even the Annual Conference of the German Party was bound to lose in interest, and that that was felt to be the case is proved by the fact that this year, in contrast to previous years, only two representatives of the parties abroad were present, and those both from Austria, while the foreign bourgeois press, equally in contrast to other years, was also conspicuous by its absence. I mention these facts because one or two bourgeois papers have seized on them as showing a feeling that in consequence of the so-called defeat of the Party at the last General Elections the party itself has lost in importance for the Socialist parties abroad as well as for the bourgeois press. As a matter of fact it is obvious enough that parties who have just been conferring with the German Party at a common conference have no need to send a representative to a national conference of that party three weeks later. The influence and importance of the German Party rests on the recognised superiority of their party organs and the fact that, both in the sphere of theory and practice, the German Party has, in many respects at least, been the model for other European countries. While it has its weaknesses, and no doubt these are sometimes serious, no party has been so thorough in its work, or has, for many years before that word was known in England, acted on the ideal of "efficiency," the highest efficiency in all departments. The importance and interest of this year's Congress was much increased by the fact that it was held in a place where for years the wealth and terrorism employed by the firm of Krupp was able to prevent either the trade unions or the party from obtaining a footing. However, that has ceased, and at this Congress nothing was more remarkable than the number of working men who sacrificed a day's work or more to crowd the galleries and to hear what was being done at their own party's Congress. I may add that the hotel-keepers deliberately charged in many cases extra prices for rooms when they knew they were for delegates, and these had to pay exorbitant prices for bad rooms. That was the relic apparently of the old feeling which had been so sedulously nourished by the firm of Krupp against the party.

One of the most important questions with which the Congress had to deal was that of the relations of the members of the so-called local organisations of trade unions to the party. These organisations represent a relic from the days of the old Socialist law, when it was almost impossible to form centralised trade organisations for the whole Empire, and the idea has continued to exist that it would be better to organise the workers according to locality and not according to trade. However, with the foundation of the national trade unions, and with the tremendous development which these have made in point of numbers, the local trade unions have become ridiculously small, and consequently have lost all right to exist as trade unions. Till recently, however, they claimed to represent the true Socialist spirit in the trade unions in contrast to the central organisations, who advocated the neutrality of the unions. Now, however, that they have become infected by Anarchist elements, and their organ, the "Einigkeit," shows leanings towards Anarchism, adopting many of their at

tacks on the party, this plea has lost validity. In consequence, the feeling has been gaining ground that we ought to exclude these elements from the party if we cannot get them to join the trade unions. There were several motions to this effect before the Congress, but, acting on the advice of the executive, and also the opinion of one of the most experienced trade union officials in Germany, Bömelburg, the Congress declined to endanger negotiations which are still going on by any hasty action, so that the question was indefinitely postponed. It is satisfactory to note that on this point the General Commission of German Trade Unions was absolutely at one with the party.

The reports on the Parliamentary work of the party and the International Congress, by Sudekum and Singer respectively, were less harmonious, and provoked a most lively debate on the relations of the party to the questions of militarism and colonial policy. Notably a speech by one of the Saxony Deputies in the patriotism of the party, and their readiness to take part in the work of national defence, which, from the fact that it had been put forward by one of our representatives in Parliament, called forth lively indignation in the party. Even Bebel's remarks in this respect would seem to have gone beyond what the occasion required. Bebel defended the deputy whose speech was called in question in a rather weak speech I thought, and the matter was passed over, but no doubt the Parliamentary group will take better care that on future occasions the speakers will not give occasion to the enemy. The Colonial question gave rise to an even more lively debate. As to what had occurred in the German group in the International Congress there were two contradictory accounts, one by Wurm and Ledebour the other by David. David seemed to be anxious to explain away his support of the unlucky resolution in favour of a Socialist Colonial policy, but without much success, and Ledebour, Kautsky, Stadhagen, and others had no difficulty in showing how completely the majority of the German section in at first supporting the majority resolution had put themselves in contradiction to the whole policy of the German Party up to the present, as well as to the binding resolution passed by the Congress at Mainz in 1900. The Radical or revolutionary section of the party had matters practically all their own way in this as in the military debate, since despite all challenges the Revisionists declined to come out into the open. Bebel's speech on the general political situation was, as might be expected, a very able and illuminating survey of the field. He analysed the results of the last Reichstag elections and showed that when we considered the strength of the forces which our opponents were able to bring into the field, the results were much better than at first appeared.

To my mind the most satisfactory part of the Congress was the discussion on the Alcohol Question. The resolution of Wurm — though he is no abstainer — was such as the Socialist abstainers could readily support, and though some thought it might have been made more plain and outspoken, I do not think that that was necessary. It lays stress on the fact that alcohol, while is no way a cause of poverty and rather a result, does at the same time react on poverty and aggravate it. Social reform, shortening of the hours of labour, and better conditions are looked to to cure the evil as well as a recognition of the dangers of alcoholism. All measures, such as prohibition and high licenses, limitation of public-houses, etc., are condemned as useless, and the workers are appealed to under no circumstances to give their children alcohol, and the party and Labour movement are pledged to do their best to free the party meetings from all compulsion to drink by substituting a direct payment for the

rooms we occupy for the payment through the drinks consumed. Wurm further pointed out that the poor and underfed workers have the most reason of all to avoid alcoholism, because, on their weakened frames, its influence was most disastrous. Wurm's speech, which was a particularly able analysis of the effects of alcoholism, will be separately published and distributed for propaganda purposes.

It was decided also to set up a party news agency under the control of the Executive of the Party, and Nuremberg was chosen for the next Congress, which will be the 40th anniversary of a very important Congress, that of the then-time Eisenachers, at which the party decided for a Socialist programme, although it consisted of organisations which, up to that time, had been nominally hostile to Socialist principles. This concluded the proceedings of the Congress.

J. B. ASKEW.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

THE FINANCES OF THE PUBLISHING HOUSE.

This month we are giving this subject the most prominent place. The book publishing house incorporated under the name of Charles H. Kerr & Company is the property of 1818 different stockholders, and the responsibility for carrying on its work successfully belongs to as many of these as are interested in that work. It can not be too often repeated that no capitalist is backing the publishing house; its manager is a wage-worker, and while there are a few of the stockholders who are popularly supposed to be wealthy, none of them are evidencing their wealth by pouring large-sums of money into our treasury. Perhaps it is better so; if we can only fight it out on this line till the debts are all paid, there will be no danger on the score of a few wealthy socialists getting control of the publishing house through their investments; the control will remain with the ten dollar share holders, who already have a large majority of the shares.

But what good will this control do them if they do not see that the debts are paid? These debts are not large; all we owe to non-stockholders would hardly represent a month's average receipts, but as long as the debt remains it is a source of danger; a constant anxiety to the manager while he is living through the situation, and a probable source of very serious ambarassment to the rest of the stockholders in the event of his not living. In view of all this, the manager offered some time ago to contribute from what the publishing house owes him a sum equal to the contributions of all other stockholders up to \$2100, for the purpose of putting the business on a cash basis. The contributions thus far received on this offer are as follows:

Acknowledged in September Review,	\$162.00
L. M. Powers, Massachusetts,	4.00
Dr. H. M. Wilson, Pennsylvania,	8.21
C. J. Thorgrinson, Iowa,	20.00
H. Otto, Manitoba,	5.00
E. Svensson, New Jersey,	2.00
J. Abeles, New York,	4.10
A. Gratz, California,	3.00
A. L. Longley, California,	5.00
W. H. Luttmann, New York,	5.00
Frank Kostack, Ohio,	17.10
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois,	73.41
<hr/>		
Total,	\$308.82.

This is rather a small beginning toward the total of \$4200 that should be raised to put the publishing house on a cash basis once for all. And the worst thing about it is that the gifts that have thus far come in are not at all proportioned to the ability of the stockholders to contribute.

The other receipts of the month were on the whole encouraging. We received \$170.16 from the subscriptions and the sale of copies of the Review, \$239.08 from the sale of stock and \$1835.73 from the sale of books, making a total with the contributions of \$2391.79. With this we have paid the ordinary expenses of the month, the balance unpaid on the plates of the second volume of "Capital", and part of the outstanding bills for the immense stock of books we are carrying in anticipation of the fall and winter demand. There still remain left-over bills to the amount of about \$1200 and current bills to the amount of about \$1000 more, all of which need to be paid this month. Two dollars from every stockholder would take care of the whole floating debt and give a comfortable working balance. But many of the stockholders are unable to do anything, and many others are indifferent. So that those who are able and willing to help will need to send sums of from \$5.00 to \$500.00 each according to their resources.

There is no deficit. The book sales every month pay all expenses and more, but the trouble is that we have not and never had the capital needed for the business, so every cent that can be raised each month goes to pay for books previously published. Once raise the capital we need, and new books can be added to our list without the unpleasant accompaniment of new debts.

PERSONAL TO NON-STOCKHOLDERS.

All this has been said to the stockholders. But their responsibility is really no greater than that of other socialists with brains enough to realize the need of circulating literature. If you are one of these, you ought to become a stockholder, - there is no other way in which ten dollars will go quite so far toward making socialists. If you can spare ten dollars all at once, send it along and you will not only get a share of stock but also the two volumes of "Capital", or any of our other books to the amount of \$4.00, expressage prepaid. If you haven't the ten dollars, send a dollar or more for books at retail prices; for each dollar you will also get a credit slip for 40 c. good any time within a year toward the purchase of a share. When your purchases of books from week to week amount to \$25, your share will be paid for, and you will then be entitled to buy any of our books at 40 per cent discount if we pay the transportation, or 50 percent if you pay it. We have over a hundred socialist books in cloth binding and over a hundred socialist pamphlets for you to select from, and we shall publish more as fast as more capital can be raised, only first we want to get out of debt.

There is one kind of debt however that is not a source of so much anxiety. This is the money lent by stockholders to the publishing house. We receive sums of \$50 to \$500 at four per cent interest, payable on thirty days' call, and smaller sums without interest, payable on demand. We have always been able to repay these loans as fast as we have been called upon for them, and to do this will be easier in the future than it has been. We are now paying more than 4 per cent on just \$800, and should be glad to convert this into 4 per cent loans to stockholders as soon as possible. But we do not intend to bring out new books with borrowed money; we prefer to defer bringing them out until the necessary capital is subscribed by those who want the books published.

BOOKS IN PRESS.

In last month's Review we gave a list of the new books published within the last few months. We give below a list of the books that we expect to publish soon.

Marxian Economics. This book by Ernest Untermann was first announced a year ago. We felt justified at the time in making the announcement, because we had the written agreement of the author to furnish us the complete manuscript not later than January, 1907. He was however delayed in his work by circumstances beyond his control, and did not give us the last of the manuscript until nearly the end of August. And the work of correcting the proofs was very slow for the reason that Comrade Untermann is in the mountains of Idaho, many miles from a railroad, so that it takes nearly two weeks to get corrected proofs back from him. The work now however is so far completed that we feel safe in promising copies for delivery in November.

And the book will prove worth waiting for. It is the best thing Ernest Untermann ever wrote, and that is saying a great deal. It is a restatement, not of what is in the first volume of "Capital", like "The Student's Marx", but of the three volumes. And its method is entirely different from that followed in any previous manual of Marxian teachings. Instead of following Marx's arrangement, a difficult one for beginners, Untermann uses Marx's historical method, showing in a story at once true and entertaining, the development of the processes by which human beings have supplied their wants from the monkey stage to the Rockefeller stage, with the effects of the various methods of production upon human ideas and institutions. When he reaches the difficult questions of value, surplus value, etc., he thus has the reader's mind prepared for the subject, and its comprehension is far easier than when approached in the usual way. (International Library of Social Science, Vol. 13, \$1.00.)

The Republic. By N. P. Andresen. This is an extended dialog of nearly 300 pages between a college professor and two capitalists in which the probable development of the Just State is discussed in detail. The book in its general plan is modeled, as its title indicates, on the Republic of Plato, and while the conclusions are revolutionary, the author's manner of thinking shows the influence of Plato's followers more than of Marx and Darwin. Revolutionary socialists who read the book will smile or groan occasionally over the implied assumption that Justice (with a capital initial) is an end which must be consciously kept in view, and that this Justice has something unchanging and supernatural about it. Yet in spite of all this, the book will prove excellent propaganda among the great mass of people who still think in terms of theology or metaphysics. Practical details are discussed with a deal of shrewd commonsense and many of the popular objections to socialism are answered convincingly. We should not forget that one object to be accomplished by our literature is to break down the belief still so widespread even among those who live by working that capitalist property is just and right. Such books as "The Republic" take the prejudiced people on the mental plane where they now are, and bring new facts to their attention. Once let them begin to study facts, and a scientific view of the facts will come later. "The Republic" is written in an interesting style, and is just the book to hand to a teacher, clergyman, merchant or farmer who is beginning to worry about the trusts but is still afraid of socialism. (International Library of Social Science, Vol. 17, \$1.00.) Ready in November.

American Communities, Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged, by William Alfred Hinds. The second edition of this book, published by us four years ago, was everywhere recognized as the standard work describing the co-operative colonies and communities in the United States. The edition has been sold out, and meanwhile the author has been putting an immense amount of labor in the revision of the work, bringing the information fully up to date, and describing other communities established since the publication of the former edition. It goes without saying that these communities have nothing in particular to do with socialism; but they constitute an economic phenomenon well worth studying, and this book when completed will be far and away the best account of them ever published. Cloth, illustrated, \$ 1.50.

Anarchism and Socialism, by George Plechanoff, translated by Eleanor Marx Aveling, with an American introduction by Robert Rives LaMonte. We will give a more extended description of this book later; meanwhile we merely quote this from LaMonte's introduction: "Anarchism proper is dying out so rapidly that it would not be worth while to re-print this book, were it merely a polemic against Anarchism; but it is far more — it is a relentless exposure of utopianism in all its forms, and utopianism in one form or another is always with us, so that we may be quite sure Plechanoff's brilliant little brochure will never be out of date till the dawn of the Day of Proletarian Triumph." (Standard Socialist Series, Vol. 23, cloth, 50 cents.)

Next month we hope to have some very attractive announcements to make, in the way of new Socialist books, but the important thing just now is to get the debt out of the way, and it can be done in short order if every reader of the Review will do his share.